

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18839

Federal disbursements in South Dakota, fiscal year 1963—Continued

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT	
Operations, salaries, rents, local transportation, etc.	\$12,672,000
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS	
Apportionments of Federal aid highway funds	22,426,694
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION	
Payroll and benefit payments, VA center and hospitals	32,281,599
OTHER AGENCIES	
Atomic Energy Commission	5,600,000
Bureau of the Census (est.)	8,329
Federal Aviation Agency (est.)	3,000,000
Internal Revenue Service	1,283,000
U.S. courts (district courts operation)	188,000
Weather Bureau	344,000
Small Business Administration:	
Business loans	2,913,000
Disaster loans (SBA share)	178,000
Joint set-aside for procurement contracts	4,098,000
Total, Small Business Administration	7,189,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency:	
Community Facilities Administration, college housing, University of South Dakota	950,000
Public Facility Loans Program	325,000
Senior Citizens Direct Loan Program	1,200,000
Public Housing Administration: Low-rent public housing	4,166,000
Federal housing loans	3,885,000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,526,000
General Service Administration:	
Federal supply	466,486
Post Office building in Pierre	2,264,494
Salaries	485,000
Repair	27,000
Total, General Services Administration	3,242,980
Grand total, federally disbursed funds in South Dakota, fiscal year 1963	507,155,261
RECAPITULATION, FEDERAL DISBURSEMENTS IN SOUTH DAKOTA, FISCAL YEAR 1963	
Agriculture Department	131,565,336
Department of Defense	165,713,000
Health, Education, and Welfare	81,661,695
Interior Department	26,588,043
Justice Department	203,635
Labor Department	2,329,300
Post Office Department	12,672,000
Bureau of Public Roads	22,426,694
Veterans' Administration	32,281,599
Atomic Energy Commission	5,600,000
Bureau of Census	8,329
Federal Aviation Agency	3,000,000
Internal Revenue Service	1,203,000
United States Courts	188,000
Weather Bureau	344,000
Small Business Administration	7,189,000

No. 158—22

Federal disbursements in South Dakota, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Housing and Home Finance Agency	
General Services Administration	\$10,526,000
Total	3,242,980
Grand total	507,155,261
Total internal revenue collections in South Dakota, fiscal year 1963	141,800,000

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if it does not take too long, and without losing my right to the floor, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], who has an amendment relating, I think, to the Italian cemeteries, where a great many Polish veterans are buried. I do not know whether this is an amendment to previous Senate action, or whether it is de novo.

Mr. DODD. It is de novo.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is to take only a few minutes, I shall be glad, without losing my right to the floor, to yield for the convenience of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Connecticut has spoken to me about this amendment. I, of course, will have to oppose it. I spoke against the other amendment for keeping up the cemeteries in Italy. I said, "If we are going to do it in Italy, why not everywhere?" But the Senate overrode me. I cannot support the amendment. If the Senate wants to do a foolish thing, it can do it. It can provide for maintenance of cemeteries in Russia, if the Senate wants to do that.

They were our allies, too. If the Senate wishes to do it, that is its right.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I will not take more than 5 minutes to explain this very simple amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator insist on a yea and nay vote?

Mr. DODD. I should like to have the amendment adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought we had disposed of all amendments, because we were about to take up the apportionment amendment. I do not wish to stand in the Senator's way. If the Senator can keep his presentation on the brief side, I shall be glad to yield to him for the purpose of bringing up his amendment, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. I heard what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has said. After he has heard what I have to say, he may change his mind.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be temporarily laid aside, for the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of it be dispensed with. I will explain it briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 7, insert immediately after currencies (a.)

On page 16, after line 17 insert the following language:

"(b.) Subject to the provisions of Section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, the President is authorized, as a demonstration of good will on the part of the people of the United States for the Polish people, to use foreign currencies that have accrued to the United States Government under this or any other Act, for assistance on such terms and conditions as he may specify, in the repair, rehabilitation, improvement, and maintenance of the Powazki Cemetery in Warsaw, which serves as the chief burial place for the tens of thousands of Polish resistance fighters who fell in the heroic Warsaw uprising of July 1944."

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is a simple amendment, to provide for the use of counterpart funds in Poland for the maintenance and improvement of the Warsaw cemetery where the resistance fighters fell in the Warsaw uprising of July 1944.

Mr. President, the Warsaw uprising of 1944 will forever rank as a sublime act of human courage and as an affirmation of man's eternal will to freedom. I consider it most appropriate that President Johnson issued an official proclamation this year in observance of the anniversary of this uprising.

The Nazi occupation of Poland was utterly ruthless in its methods. But despite the Nazi terror, despite the executions and the torture chambers, the Polish nation succeeded in building up a secret state apparatus that commanded the loyalty of the people in cities, towns, and villages throughout their country. They built up and trained and armed a secret army, known as the Polish Home Army, in anticipation of the day of liberation.

When the Soviet Red army approached the outskirts of Warsaw driving the Nazis before it, the Polish Home Army felt that the time to strike had come. In this they were encouraged by the official Soviet broadcasts, which called on the people of Warsaw to rise up and expel the Nazi occupiers.

The Warsaw uprising ended in tragedy. The city of Warsaw was left in ruins and scores of thousands of its citizens were killed. But the Warsaw uprising was not in vain. For the Polish people and for free men everywhere, it has a symbolic significance. Through centuries to come, it will serve as proof of man's indomitable spirit and of his invincible will to freedom. It has served to keep alive the faith of the Polish

13840

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

people in the ultimate victory of their cause, and to sustain them in the difficulties and suffering they have had to endure since the close of World War II.

We can best salute the memory of the Poles who fell in this valiant struggle by renewing our dedication to the goal of a free and independent Poland, living in peace with the nations of the world.

There are certain concrete things we can do to hasten this day. President Johnson has spoken of the importance of building bridges to the people of Poland and of the other captive nations. I believe that by releasing American counterpart funds for the maintenance and rehabilitation of the Powazki Cemetery in Warsaw, we will be building an important bridge of sympathy and understanding with the people of Poland.

The Powazki Cemetery holds the remains of tens of thousands of Polish freedom fighters who fell in the heroic Warsaw uprising. For the people of Poland it remains to this day a hallowed place, where thousands of citizens congregate on every anniversary of the Warsaw uprising. Having already decided to make counterpart funds in Italy available for the repair and rehabilitation of the graves of the Polish soldiers who died in combat in Italy, I think it only appropriate that we should take similar action on behalf of the immortal dead of the Polish Home Army who died in the Warsaw Uprising.

I hope that this amendment will be given sympathetic consideration by my colleagues.

That is all that the amendment would do. I cannot conceive of any Senator voting against it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the cemetery to which the Senator refers limited to military personnel, or is it a cemetery in which civilians also are buried?

Mr. DODD. The name of the cemetery is the Powazki Cemetery. It holds the remains of tens of thousands of Polish freedom fighters who fell in the Warsaw uprising. As I have said, for the people of Poland it remains to this day a hallowed place.

Mr. KEATING. But it is a shrine, almost, for the Polish freedom fighters, who were the resistance fighters, and who showed such heroism in the Warsaw uprising in July 1944. Is that correct?

Mr. DODD. It is exactly correct.

Mr. KEATING. I commend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for offering the amendment. It is very reasonable. The cost for maintaining the cemetery, as I understand, will be met from counterpart funds.

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. It will not be paid for by the taxpayers of this country. I shall certainly support the amendment. The world will long remember the heroic struggle of the Polish Home Army to liberate Warsaw from alien control. While the Poles fought, the secret armies waited. They did not offer help or support to the Poles. They waited until

the Polish forces were virtually wiped out before they moved in, to assert by force, Soviet Communist control over Poland. The stark contrast between Polish heroism and Soviet treachery is clear.

I will be grateful if the distinguished Senator will allow me to become a cosponsor.

Mr. DODD. I shall be honored to have the Senator become a cosponsor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may join as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Russians have a very uneasy conscience about the Polish freedom fighters? As I remember the situation, the Russian armies were almost at the gates of Warsaw when the Polish freedom fighters revolted inside the city. The Russians could have come to their help very readily, but they refused to do so. They halted on the outskirts of the city and permitted the Nazis to exterminate the freedom fighters. Then, only after the freedom fighters had been killed and eliminated, did the Communist armies move in.

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is a very sore point with the conscience of the Russians and the conscience of the Poles. Undoubtedly one of the reasons why they are trying to downgrade the treatment of the cemetery is that the heroism of the Poles reflects unfavorably upon the cowardice of the Russians.

Mr. DODD. As usual, the Senator has put it much more clearly than I could possibly have stated it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Yesterday I took it upon myself to determine the amount of Italian lire which we have available for taking care of the Polish cemetery in Italy. I found that we have none available. It seems to me that unless we wish to play a hoax on the Polish people, we should put up enough good American dollars to buy sufficient Italian lire to take care of these cemeteries. I do not see any other way out of the situation. The other day the Senate, out of the goodness of its heart, approved the amendment and gave the Polish people the impression that we would do something. Now we find that we cannot do it with our existing resources. It seems to me, having agreed to do it, the only decent thing to do is to appropriate enough American dollars to acquire the Italian lire.

Mr. DODD. I could not agree more with the Senator from Vermont. I know he agrees with me that huge amounts of counterpart funds are available in Poland.

Mr. AIKEN. We have zlotys available.

Mr. DODD. There is no question about our having adequate funds available in Poland.

Mr. AIKEN. We have plenty of zlotys, Indian rupees, and Egyptian pounds. Aside from those currencies, I do not believe much soft currency is available. We have a little here and a little there. So far as the Italian lire are concerned, we are out.

Mr. DODD. That is regrettable. I am sure the Senator agrees with me that when we have the money, as in Poland, we should use it for this purpose.

It would not cost much to take care of the cemetery, where tens of thousands of freedom fighters are buried. It will be good for the free world if we do it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have been to Warsaw, as has the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I know something about the physical circumstances to which the Senator refers. Anyone who has seen the little urns with flowers in almost every street of Warsaw can appreciate this amendment and the terrible suffering and sacrifice of the Polish people, when the Nazis sealed off two sides of a street, blew a whistle, and indiscriminately shot four or five people in the street; then unsealed the street and passed on as quickly as they had come.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. It is a fact that this proposal would not be inaugurating anything new in Poland. We maintain a large hospital there, and we are helping the people. That is provided for in the bill, is it not?

Mr. DODD. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. So it would not be a new scheme of operation, would it?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from New York for raising that point. This is nothing new. It would be in complete conformity with our policy heretofore, and up to the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [putting the question].

The Chair is in doubt and will ask for a division.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. DODD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18841

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Is the question on the reconsideration of the amendment? I understood that the majority leader had asked to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader asked unanimous consent that the vote be reconsidered, and his request was agreed to. The Senate now is in the process of voting on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, not many Senators were in the Chamber when the amendment was proposed. The amendment is an extension of the principle adopted the other night with respect to cemeteries in Italy.

The Senate evidently is being asked now to assume the obligation of keeping up all foreign cemeteries which contain the bodies of soldiers who may have fought on the side of our allies. I want Senators to be aware of what they are voting on. It would seem to me that this could be an open, unlimited obligation. If we do it for the cemeteries of Poland, I see no logical reason why we should not do it for all other cemeteries, wherever they may be located. The Senate ought to consider what it is being asked to do.

I opposed the amendment the other night, but the Senate chose to assume the obligation. If the United States is to keep up the cemeteries in Poland, it is likely that there are Members of this body some of whose constituents have come from other countries and who will want the United States to keep up the cemeteries in those countries.

I do not see why the Senate should be compelled, almost, in order to satisfy other minority groups, to assume similar obligations all over the world. It could amount to a huge sum of money.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Could this proposal actually be described as foreign aid for the dead?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; for the dead Poles, I suppose. In effect, it would actually be done for the relief of the Polish Government, for which I know many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have great affection. The effect would be to enable the Polish Government to escape its obligation to maintain its own cemeteries.

I assume that the cemeteries are in existence; I do not know whether they are. I know nothing about the cemetery in question. I suppose there is such a cemetery in Poland, although I recall reading that many of the dead Polish people were piled into trenches in those days. The Government was rather ruthless.

I do not know whether Poland has cemeteries similar to ours or not. We are opening up a field to which there is no end. Such an amendment ought to be considered in an orderly manner, a bill should be introduced, and an appropriation authorized, whether it be for \$10 or \$100 million. If it is desired to spend money on foreign cemeteries, that ought to be done in an orderly way. We do not know anything about this cemetery or the one in Italy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree with the chairman of the committee. I can find no legal, moral, or social responsibility on this country to undertake this sort of activity.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say that there was not such a cemetery in Italy; I said that if it is to be done in Italy, we might be asked to do it all over the world.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Would this not be aid to a Communist government?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not suppose it would be of great aid to them; but in effect, whatever the amount, it would be aid.

Mr. THURMOND. I agree with the distinguished chairman. I am wondering if we should not cut off any other aid to Communist governments, as well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not objecting particularly to the amount; it is the general principle of undertaking the upkeep of cemeteries all over the world, where people who may have been allied with us or who were sympathetic to our cause may be buried. It is a rather open-ended proposal. If it is to be done, it should be done in an orderly way, after proper hearings before committees, and with the authorization of funds in the regular way. This is a rather casual way to commit this country to unknown obligations.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to answer the arguments that have been raised against the amendment.

The Senator from Tennessee asked, "Is it foreign aid to the dead?" My answer is: Yes; it is a debt due to the dead Polish heroes who stood on our side in the Warsaw uprising, expecting the Communists across the river to come to their aid, but who, by the tens of thousands, were slaughtered and lie buried in unmarked graves. That is the answer to that argument.

Is it foreign aid to the Communists? asks the Senator from South Carolina. No. It is foreign aid to the dead Polish heroes and the living Polish heroes and anti-Communists, and U.S. citizens of Polish ancestry by the millions in this country. It is a tribute to the anti-Communist dead who lie in the unmarked cemetery in Warsaw, and whose relatives will know that the people of America have not forgotten them.

In answer to the question of the Senator from Arkansas, Does the proposal need hearings? I say that everybody knows—even small children know—the

story of the heroes of the Warsaw uprising. What hearings do we need at this hour of history?

What would the proposal cost? Not one red cent. We have millions of dollars in Communist Poland banks. We can use very little of them. It would cost very little money to make certain that this cemetery, where lie those heroes, is properly cared for.

It is asked, "Would this proposal lead to a demand that we take care of similar cemeteries all over the world where anti-Communist heroes are buried?" I say, Good. I hope it will. I cannot think of anything better for us to do with the billions of dollars we are peddling around the world for highly questionable projects than to spend a few paltry dollars to mark the cemeteries in which lie the bodies of anti-Communist heroes. I say to the Senator from Arkansas that I hope this action will become a precedent.

I hope we will do it all over the world. I cannot think of anything better that can be done for the cause of freedom. That is my answer to the arguments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DODD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut, and I shall support his amendment.

Mr. DODD. I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon. I am only sorry that more Senators are not present in the Chamber, because I am quite sure that if all Senators heard this discussion, there would be only a handful of votes against the amendment.

I am confident that if the American people heard the discussion, they would demand that we pay this tribute.

No cost in dollars is involved. It is a small tribute to those who fought on our side.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the question now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and, if there be no further discussion, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], are necessarily absent.

18842

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 37, as follows:

[No. 544 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alken	Fong	Mundt
Bartlett	Hart	Nelson
Bayh	Hartke	Neuberger
Beall	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Hruska	Pell
Boggs	Humphrey	Prouty
Brewster	Inouye	Proxmire
Burdick	Javits	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Ribicoff
Case	Kuchel	Salinger
Church	Long, Mo.	Scott
Clark	Long, La.	Stennis
Cotton	Magnuson	Symington
Curtis	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Dodd	Metcalfe	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Edmondson	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—37

Allott	Hickenlooper	Morton
Bennett	Hill	Moss
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston	Russell
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Simpson
Dirksen	Jordan, Idaho	Smathers
Dominick	Mansfield	Smith
Eastland	McCarthy	Sparkman
Ellender	McClellan	Talmadge
Ervin	McGee	Thurmond
Fulbright	McNamara	Tower
Gore	Mechem	
Gruening	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—12

Anderson	Kennedy	Pearson
Cannon	Lausche	Saltonstall
Goldwater	McGovern	Walters
Hayden	Muskie	Yarborough

So Mr. Dodd's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

AMENDMENT NO. 1218

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] have offered their amendment concerning reapportionment, a subject which has nothing to do with the foreign aid bill.

Some time ago I submitted a resolution, in which 63 other Senators joined me, condemning the Soviet Union for persecution of the Jews. Since it appears that action may not be taken on that resolution, I send to the desk, an amendment incorporating that resolution, ask that it be printed, and that the Senate go on record as condemning religious persecution by the Soviet Union against Jews and those of other faiths as well.

The amendment is being cosponsored by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

I shall ask for the yeas and nays when the amendment is called up. I plan to

call up the amendment after the Senate disposes of the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I advise the Senate that we are taking up the reapportionment amendment at the present time. I shall be as brief as possible and try to sketch in broad strokes what has happened, how this proposal happened to come here, and what has happened in the country with respect to sentiment as a result of the Supreme Court decision in the case of Reynolds against Sims. I may repeat some of the observations I made late last night when this amendment was laid down.

By way of preliminary, this is a jointly sponsored amendment by the distinguished majority leader and myself. It represents most patient and painstaking work, in which endeavor we invited the staff of the majority leader, as well as my own staff. Sitting with us was the Deputy Attorney General and the Solicitor of the Department of Justice. We spent a good many days on this task since I first framed a proposal with respect to a stay of proceedings of the Supreme Court decision. Some time in midafternoon yesterday, we finally came to the conclusion that we could agree on the language that is now before the Senate in the form of this amendment.

I believe that since we are not always too diligent in reading the material that is before us, it might be well for me to read the pertinent sections of the amendment. This amendment is intended as a section to part 4 of the foreign assistance bill.

I am not insensible when I say, with some modesty, to my distinguished friend from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that it might be regarded as an incongruity when one offers an amendment of this kind to a foreign assistance bill. But it is reality that compels this course of action.

I thought that if the amendment were ready at the time, it might be attached to the interest equalization rate bill, which was reported from the Committee on Finance. That bill involved so many technicalities that I rather shuddered at the thought.

Incidentally, although two versions of the amendment were presented at that time—and, before we were through, a third and fourth version were presented—I was not sure that we would be ready to offer the amendment to that bill.

There was the possibility that perhaps next week the amendment could be offered to the social security bill, which is still pending in the Senate Finance Committee. However, that bill has generated controversy on its own. I can say with some authority that if perchance the medicare proposals that will be offered—and there are at least three of them—should be attached to that bill and go to conference, and the Senate conferees were adamant in their position, conceivably there might not be a social security bill at all.

I believe I read correctly the temper of the members of the Ways and Means Committee; and I have taken time to do a little conferring.

If the amendment is to have any value, it must reach the President's desk before adjournment. It must get there before the hour comes when the majority leader and I call the White House and ask the President whether he has any other business to lay before the Congress. I have had occasion to do that for a number of years. If the President says "No," the Congress will be free to adjourn. So it must be done before that time, and therefore the amendment must be attached to a bill that will reach the President for signature.

So by a process of elimination it was quite clear to me that if we were to take a statutory approach to the question, there was nothing to do except to offer the amendment to the pending bill, incongruous as it might seem.

On the other hand, I see no real incongruity in trying to look after our own people in our own States when we are lavishing our largess upon people in all the corners of the earth. If we can take time to study and discuss the subject, notwithstanding what may appear to be an incongruity, the proposal will not seem so farfetched after all.

Besides the amendment is important because there is an almost volcanic feeling in the country today.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would prefer not to do so until I complete my statement.

Mr. President, I was advised that today, by a vote of 10 to 4, the House Rules Committee voted out what is known as the Tuck resolution, named for Representative Tuck. I believe it is infinitely tougher, infinitely stronger, and infinitely less flexible than the amendment which the majority leader and I have offered after long and painful study with a good many people sitting around the table. That is the principal reason why the amendment is being offered to the pending bill.

There is one further reason. The bill is divided into four parts. If Senators will examine the titles to those parts, they will notice that part IV is entitled "Amendments to Other Laws." The sky is the limit. "Amendments to Other Laws" can mean any act, no matter what it might be. So I thought certainly the amendment would be in harmony with that designation, for the proposal is an amendment to the code. Therefore, very properly, it belongs under that title.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The part entitled "Amendments to Other Laws" is hardly meant to indicate that the sky is the limit. "Other Laws" must be relevant to the bill—for example, Public Law 480 programs. Amendments of that kind have often been offered. I do not believe that the record shows that we have undertaken in the bill to reach out and go into the apportionment provision of our Constitution.

Most of the amendments that have been proposed are reasonably relevant to the foreign aid program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not quarrel unfelicitously with my distinguished friend from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not quarreling; I am pointing out a fact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. On page 16, line 18, of the foreign assistance bill, the following language appears:

Part 4—Amendments to Other Laws.

There is no limitation and no qualification whatsoever.

Mr. President, if the Senate had a germaneness rule, I believe the amendment would still qualify as being germane under that part.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The whole purpose of the foreign aid bill, as I understand it, is to promote democracy and friendship among democracies in as many Nations of the world as is possible. The purpose of the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment, as I understand it, is to preserve democracy in the United States. Therefore I would consider the amendment entirely germane.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that statement is so much more graciously put than I, with my feeble talent, could express it that I am delighted that my distinguished friend from Vermont intervened.

We might trace a little of the history. A case was brought in the State of Tennessee. My distinguished friend, the Senator from Tennessee, knows all about it. I refer to the case of Baker against Carr.

The question of apportionment had been in the air in Tennessee for a long time, but no action was ever taken until this particular group finally took action and the case came to the high tribunal here in Washington.

While the facts were somewhat different, and the issues might be different, yet the basic issue was present.

As a result of what happened in the Supreme Court's finding in the case of Baker against Carr, 60 suits were filed in 37 States with reference to the question of apportionment. In some of those there was, either in whole or in part, some reapportionment. In others there was none.

But coming on the heels of that case was a case that came from Alabama under the caption of Reynolds against Sims. Joined in that case were probably half dozen other States, including Maryland, Delaware, Colorado, Virginia, New York, and there may have been others. That is the historic and celebrated case in which the Chief Justice wrote the opinion and a very distinguished and scholarly Associate Justice, formerly from Illinois, John Marshall Harlan, wrote the dissenting opinion. I think it is one of the most devastating dissenting opinions that I have ever read.

In my considered judgment, Associate Justice Harlan blew the Supreme Court and its argument right out of the water. It was a historical document, to say the least; and for a long time it will be read

and treated with the highest respect by law students from this day on, as well as by all members of the bar. But it started with Baker against Carr and then went to Reynolds against Sims.

I now invite the attention of Senators to the manner in which interest has developed in the question. In September of 1962 an organization known as the National Legislative Conference, which is affiliated with the Council of State Governments, met in Phoenix, Ariz. There were 750 delegates. They consisted of State officers, officials, and members of the conference.

They finally passed a resolution asking the Council of State Governments to include three proposed amendments on their agenda at the 1962 general assembly which met in the city of Chicago. The report was rendered by the Committee on Federal-State Relations, and it was filed with the Council of State Governments on December 5, 1962.

Of the three amendments, No. 2 dealt with the proposal to amend the Federal Constitution with respect to reapportionment. There was a rollcall vote. Twenty-six States voted for it. Ten States voted "no." There were 10 abstentions.

Since all that happened, two States in opposition—namely, New York and Colorado—have switched over to the other side. That makes 28. One abstention switched over. That was Ohio. That makes 29 States that have gone on record with respect to the reapportionment problem.

I can state with knowledge that Ohio has come over because day before yesterday the Lieutenant Governor of Ohio called me about this matter. Only 2 days ago there was a telegram from the President of the New York State Assembly to the effect that he endorsed and his associates endorsed the approach we were taking to this problem and what we were trying to do in order to bring about relief.

What has happened since Reynolds against Sims is astounding. In the State of Oklahoma the Federal Court invalidated the results of an election. So far as I know, it is the first time in the history of this Republic that anything of that kind has happened.

I have in my hand an Associated Press dispatch from Oklahoma City, dated August 1, which reads:

Quick appeals to the U.S. Supreme Court loomed today after the Federal court, in an unprecedented stroke of judicial power, ordered new legislative elections in Oklahoma this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, was that in the State legislatures?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That refers to the State legislatures. Another paragraph of that dispatch reads:

The Court ordered Gov. Henry Bellmon to conduct special elections to obtain a legislature with membership divided into equal population districts. Governor Bellmon said he would obey "without further delay."

The ruling stirred nationwide interest inasmuch as many other States face similar legislative reapportionment problems, brought to a head by recent U.S. Supreme Court rulings that both houses of a State legislature must be based on population.

In Washington the Justice Department believes the Oklahoma case marks the first time a Federal court has struck down legislative elections because of malapportionment.

Mr. President, I can readily understand why today, in the rural as well as the metropolitan newspapers of Oklahoma, there is a great to do and there are statewide fulminations over the impact of the Supreme Court decision.

In New York the results were even a little more fantastic, for when the Court got through it required that, while the New York Constitution provides for 2-year terms for its legislators, in the next election they will have to be elected for 1 year. Then there is to be a second election, and they are to be elected for another year. Then there is to be a third election, when they are to be elected for a regular term.

Those are some of the fantastic results.

But in the great sovereign State of Colorado, so ably represented by my distinguished friend sitting in front of me, the three-judge court gave the legislature 15 days to convene and to comply with the decision in Reynolds against Sims. There was difficulty in even obtaining a quorum, but they were good citizens. They tried to comply. They came forth with new apportionment problems. The case went almost immediately to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and that supreme court very quickly declared the legislature's handiwork unconstitutional. So where is Colorado today? Frankly, I do not think it knows where it is, in view of all these facts, or exactly where the appeal will have to go.

In his dissenting opinion, Justice Harlan said that while only 6 States are now involved, it is fair to assume that what has happened thus far will happen with respect to the other 44 States as well. I can see nothing but legislative and juridical chaos unless something is done.

In our approach, we sought to abide by what we thought was a fundamental principle; namely, that when the Supreme Court interprets a provision of the Constitution, the so-called equal protection clause, the only way it can be met is by a constitutional amendment to modify the effect of that ruling of the Court.

Parenthetically, we are not here trying to throw the decision in Reynolds against Sims out the window. The only thing that is involved in the Mansfield-Dirksen proposal is to buy time to do something by the constitutional route.

If we were to do it in the normal constitutional procedure, it would have to go through the committee of the Senate and then the Senate. It would have to go through the committee of the House and then the House. It would require a two-thirds vote. The proposal would have to be sent to the States. It would have to be in orbit for 7 years. It would require ratification by three-fourths of the States.

Meanwhile the effect of the decision in Reynolds against Sims would continue to be applied and, at long last, there might be a hardened pattern that could never be undone, no matter what inequity or abuse might be involved.

So obviously there was no comfort in trying to approach this problem by the

18844

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

normal constitutional route. There was no time. Besides, everyone is looking longingly at the calendar every day, for sticking up there in the calendar, as big as life, is the numeral "22." That means August 22, 1964. That is a Saturday. There is, if not an expressed, at least a fervent, hope that, at long last, we can drop the adjournment curtain, and our associates can depart from this stage and go and make mischief and medicine and have fun at Atlantic City.

We shall be watching on television. We shall be sharpening our axes, so that when you come back with your platform and your candidate, we shall be ready for the fray. There will be no acrimony. There will be no untoward feeling. There will be no malice. It will be even as the jousting knights of old came at each other with a rush. So we shall do battle, in the hope that our cause will prevail.

That is why August 22 means so much. That fact was not lost on me. I thought that was a further reason why we must act before this Congress ends. We must find a vehicle that we can use. That is the reason why it is here today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, I agree with the Senator, except that the foreign aid bill is a very weak vehicle and a very poor vehicle to use. That is the only part of the Senator's suggestion that I do not agree with. I do not agree with him on the vehicle he has selected. I am in sympathy with the substance of his proposals.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In answer to my affable friend from Arkansas, I need only to resort to a cliché, that we are faced, not with a theory, but with a condition.

What else is there to do? Would the Senator initiate it as an independent bill? It would not have the chance of a snowball in Sheol. If there is any doubt about it, I ask Senators to look up the Old Testament, and they will find where Sheol is. It is hot there. A snowball would have no chance there. That is how much chance we would have.

I wished to be sure that the vehicle would be a bill that had to go to the President.

Incidentally, this gives me the opportunity to say that I did not take the Chief Executive by surprise. A week ago yesterday I spent a very happy hour and a half with the President of the United States in one of those chummy, well-furnished, comfortable rooms in the White House. There we talked even as in the days when I used to go over to the office in the corner of the Capitol and sit down on one of those deep chairs, when the President was the majority leader of the Senate.

We talked across the table. I had on paper all the items that I wished to discuss with the President. I finally reached this item, and I said, "Mr. President, I am sure that you will not like this, but I have no choice. I feel dutybound to do this. So I give you the language that I have drafted thus far." It has been modified, but the purpose is the same. I said, "I have to find a vehicle on which it can take a ride and land in the middle of that big beautiful desk in the room next door. If it does not land there,

of course, we are out of court. We go nowhere, and our objective fails. But I am hopeful that it will land on that table."

Then I hope he will summon our distinguished friend from Arkansas, the majority leader, and myself, perhaps at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, the vesper hour, when the spirit is in a state of repose and, for the hardened sinners, when the sun is over the yardarm; and there will be a great concourse of people assembled. I hope there will be a hundred pens in the pen set on the desk. There are a hundred Senators. So, if we are all present, I hope he will take those pens and sign the foreign assistance bill; and while he may be expatiating upon what we are doing for the benighted people in the Congo, the wretches in some areas of Africa, for those people who have hauled down our flag in Ghana, and for people all over the world, in our hearts there will be a little throb of thanksgiving because we are going to do a little something to try to preserve the Federal-State Union.

If that is not an impulse for inspiration, I do not know what is.

That is the way I came up. I do not know where I got this strange belief, as it seems to some people, but I learned in high school, as a freshman, that we had a Federal-State Union. Some people have tried to disabuse me of that idea, and some people would like to strike the State part. As J. Hamilton Lewis, the colorful Senator from my State, once said to me in the Mayflower Hotel, "My boy"—I was young enough then to be his son—he said, "My boy, I shall not live to see the day, but you will live to see the day when the boundaries of States are nothing more than marks upon maps for the guidance of tourists. If we persist in denuding the powers of the State and their legislatures, and if we continue to build up this great central structure in Washington, that will be the ultimate end."

That issue is involved here.

I always thought we had a Federal-State Union, even though some people may think it is an aberration on the part of a conservative who still lives in this age.

I believe somewhere in the Constitution I read a clause which states that the power that is not delegated to the Federal Government is reserved to the people. By "people" we mean the States. That clause is still there. Perhaps it is bemusing and even amusing to a great many people. I always thought that those oldtimers who came to Philadelphia to fabricate that Constitution in 1787 knew what they were about when they said, "So much power belongs to the Federal Government, and no more; and the rest of it we keep in our tight fists."

It is still there, but subject, evidently, to controversy. I learned long ago that the people are the fountainhead of all power in this country. If they are not, let us take the preamble and strike out the first words, "We, the people," for various purposes, "do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

I presume, as I read some of the con-dign epithets and rather unpleasant aspirations by the law school deans and others on what I am trying to do—and sometimes I suspect the deans a little, having been in a law school—I feel that perhaps one ought to look elsewhere for a fundamental. So I go back to the Constitution—"We the people of the United States." They reserved their powers and gave the Federal Government so much. If Senators do not think the Constitution is vibrant and alive, let them push something through this body and the other body and get a signature from the President, and then have some citizen, high or humble, finally get up to the Supreme Court, that white structure across the way, and say, "They cannot do this to me, because it contravenes the Constitution." How many times that has been done.

In the State of Georgia, long ago, a man named Angelo Herndon, with his pockets bulging with "Red" literature, was walking around the square in Atlanta. He was grabbed by the police, and before he knew it, he was in the chain gang.

There he stayed until, through his representative and lawyer, his case was brought before the Supreme Court. His lawyer said the man had not been given a fair trial under the Constitution. What did the High Court say? One would not expect any sympathy in the hearts of those black-robed Justices for a man who was wedded to a doctrine for the destruction of this country. But what did the High Court say? "Take the chains off him and let him be, until you give him a fair trial."

That is one of the great cases decided by the Supreme Court.

Out in Nebraska another case arose. Under the impetus of war fever, legislatures can sometimes do strange things. In Nebraska, a statute was enacted to forbid the teaching of German in the Nebraska schools. As I recall, it was a group of highminded and patriotic Legionnaires who brought the case to the Supreme Court. They said to the Court, "If a school board can stop the teaching of German, it can also stop the teaching of Latin; it can stop the teaching of biology; it can stop the teaching of chemistry; it can stop the teaching of rhetoric. The war, the fevers of war, and the hates of war have nothing to do with this."

The Court struck down that statute of the State of Nebraska. "We, the people" were speaking, thank God.

Out in Oregon the legislature enacted a law which provided, in effect, that every child of school age must attend a public school. What was wrong with that? Was that not all right? Certainly.

But what about the Baptist fathers and mothers who wanted their children to learn something of the Bible? What about the Catholic fathers and mothers who wanted their children to attend parochial school, where they could worship in the tradition of their fathers, their grandfathers, and their great grandfathers? What about the Methodist children, the Mormon children, and

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18845

the other children, whose parents were willing to pay the bill for educating their children in their own schools, where they could receive the teaching of the Great Book and read the inspiring pages?

The Society of Sisters in Oregon, through their counsel, came across the country and stood before the High Court and asked, "Can our legislature do this to us?" The Court struck down the Oregon statute. As the Preamble says, "We, the people," were talking. "We, the people," are involved here.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator going to get me off the track?

Mr. HART. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no track, anyway.

Mr. HART. If the Senator from Illinois—and rightly so—believes that the Court is to be trusted to protect the people, and did protect them in those cases, why not let the Court continue to protect the people in the apportionment cases?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Because the issue is quite different.

Mr. HART. Just how?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Within the next 3 or 4 hours I expect to get around to that.

I have recited these cases to show that the Constitution is still a vibrant thing. Certain provisions in it—the powers reserved to the States—are involved here, including the power of the States to compose and constitute their own legislatures.

I say to my distinguished friend from Michigan, who is an able lawyer, that if he has not read John Marshall Harlan's dissent, he ought to read it, because Justice Harlan goes all the way back. He examines meticulously the entire history of this subject, and points out the things that have been forgotten by the Supreme Court.

I am glad the Senator has alluded to that subject, because he gives me an opportunity to read from that decision. I shall read from the conclusion. Perhaps the conclusion will be enough at this time. Incidentally, I placed the whole dissent in the Record last night. It is worthy of presentation to the Senate because it is the conclusion of Justice Harlan. It appears on page 38 of the decision, which was handed down in the October term of 1963.

CONCLUSION

With these cases the Court approaches the end of the third round set in motion by the complaint filed in *Baker v. Carr*. What is done today deepens my conviction that judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill advised and constitutionally impermissible. As I have said before, *Wesberry v. Sanders*, supra, at 48, I believe that the vitality of our political system, on which in the last analysis all else depends, is weakened by reliance on the judiciary for political reform; in time a complacent body politic may result.

These decisions also cut deeply into the fabric of our federalism. What must follow from them may eventually appear to be the product of State legislatures. Nevertheless, no thinking person can fail to recognize that the aftermath of these cases, however desirable it may be thought in itself, will have been achieved at the cost of a radical alterna-

tion in the relationship between the States and the Federal Government, more particularly the Federal judiciary. Only one who has an overbearing impatience with the Federal system and its political processes will believe that the cost was too high or was inevitable.

Finally, these decisions give support to a current mistaken view of the Constitution and the constitutional function of this court. This view, in a nutshell, is that every major social ill in this country can find its cure in some constitutional "principle," and that this Court should "take the lead" in promoting reform when other branches of government fail to act. The Constitution is not a panacea for every blot upon the public welfare, nor should this Court, ordained as a judicial body, be thought of as a general haven for reform movements. The Constitution is an instrument of government, fundamental to which is the premise that in a diffusion of governmental authority lies the greatest promise that this Nation will realize liberty for all its citizens.

There is something else to be added, but I believe that is enough for the moment.

I point out that what is involved is the Federal-State relationship, the reserve powers, and how meticulously they are justified and spelled out as to how the authority is to be maintained in the States with respect to the composition of the legislatures. The majority of the Court had their eyes centered on the first section of the 14th amendment and completely forgot what was in section 2, so far as the authority of the States and the legislatures is concerned.

I mention two problems. One is time, and the other is that we had no opportunity to formulate and complete action on a constitutional amendment, in view of the looming shadow of adjournment. Therefore, we had to resort to the statutory course, in order to accomplish our object.

A statute is worth little or nothing in a controversial area unless we are reasonably sure that it is constitutional.

Let no one forget for a moment that this proposal will go to the high court. The subject has been carried on the front pages of the newspapers all too long. Editorials without end have been written. In the Mansfield-Dirksen proposal, there is an item to the effect that it is appealable; and under the section of the code that calls for expedition, it will get to the high court in short order. Then we shall know.

But, Mr. President, I am at liberty to say tonight that the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Nicholas Katzenbach, before he left the conference in Senator Mansfield's office yesterday, permitted me to say that in his judgment what we had achieved in the Mansfield-Dirksen proposal was constitutional.

I could add the name of one other high official in the Department of Justice, but because of his peculiar relationship to the courts and his very peculiar function, it is probably not the prudent thing for me to do; otherwise I could have given his name, also.

So we feel that what we have wrought is on good constitutional ground and will stand the constitutional test.

Mr. President, I shall not undertake to do more with the amendment tonight,

except to say that tomorrow I hope to go into an analysis of the problem and answer any questions that may arise.

I would prefer not to be quizzed tonight. It has been a long day. I was at my desk at 5:30 o'clock this morning, and the spirit begins to quail a little at his hour of the afternoon.

But before I complete these preliminary remarks—and the next 2 or 3 hours I shall save for tomorrow, when Senators are fresher—and when I am fresher—I must read a dispatch to the Senate because it is most interesting:

The leader of the House forces supporting the Supreme Court, "one man, one vote," ruling said today he would accept a Senate compromise proposal to delay its effect in preference to a much tougher House bill.

A very distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee of another legislative body—and I continue the dispatch—made the statement after testifying against a surprise maneuver by court critics to force a showdown on legislation that would seek to eliminate Federal court jurisdiction over State reapportionment cases.

This very distinguished chairman—and I continue the dispatch—

told reporters if he had to take a choice between a proposal by Senate Republican and Democratic leaders that would provide a delay in court-ordered reapportionment of State legislatures and the bill—

By a distinguished Representative—his name is here, but I cannot tell Senators what it is—

that he would accept the Senate version. The veteran—

From this particular State—

who earlier would go no further than saying the Senate proposal was an "approach" to an agreement, wound up his appearance before the Rules Committee by urging consideration of the proposal advanced by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois—

He should have included MICHAEL MANSFIELD, Democrat, from Montana—as a rider on the foreign aid bill.

The distinguished chairman of the other legislative body—as I continue the dispatch—

finding himself caught in a squeeze play on the reapportionment issue, denounced the Tuck bill as a radical attempt to start taking away all the powers of the Federal court. He said the bill was unconstitutional on its face.

Thus, we observe the thinking of others, in what we have tried to incorporate in the bill before the Senate.

We believe that we have done a good job. We believe that the amendment is constitutional. We believe that it is restrained. We believe that it would consummate the one objective which we have had constantly in mind—that is, to buy time at an awkward period when adjournment and the end of the year is imminent, so that as the 89th Congress comes into being, we shall be ready to launch a resolution for a constitutional amendment in the hope that it can be expedited through the Senate and the House of Representatives, and that there will be ample time for the legislatures of the various States to quickly impress their will upon it. Then we shall have

18846

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

found a durable solution to the problem which emanated from the decision in Reynolds against Sims.

Mr. President, this is the first chapter of my story. Like the old serials—"Continued in our next"—I trust that I shall get around to the rest of it tomorrow.

At the moment, I yield the floor.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HART. The State legislatures which the Senator contemplates acting on in a constitutional amendment would or would not be constitutional under the Reynolds decision. This, at root, is what we are faced with. Is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Possibly so. But, as a matter of fact we are fighting over a condition that the Court has created. It was not the making of the State legislatures. It was not initiated by the State government. Why did the Supreme Court not take a realistic view of it, as they did in the Brown school case 10 years ago, and say, "They must go ahead with all deliberate speed," instead of setting up a three-man court and saying to the Governor, "You have 15 days in which to convene the legislature and get the job done." What in the name of commonsense kind of business is that—getting so little time on a matter that is of great moment to the State? And when I say "great moment," I mean exactly that.

I am glad the Senator asked the question. It gives me an opportunity to add one further statement. When the Chief Justice was Governor of the Sunshine State of California, back in 1948, this is what he had to say:

Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting representation in the Senate to a strictly population basis.

That was in 1948. But this is 1964. The Governor is now the Chief Justice of the High Tribunal. Sixteen years later he said:

Legislatures represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests.

The Government had an entirely different notion about it than the Chief Justice.

Mr. HART. Is it not true that his responsibilities were vastly different, and today he is telling us what the Constitution of the United States tells us?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not too sure about that. I think the responsibility of the Governor of California, which will soon become the largest, most populous, and probably the richest State in the Union, is a responsibility that will compare with that of the Chief Magistrate of the High Tribunal of the country. And I do not demean it for one moment so far as its importance is concerned.

Mr. HART. With respect to the honor accorded, each is high. With regard to the obligation, it is clear. Earl Warren spoke to us in the Reynolds case concerning the constitutional rights of citizens. As the Governor of California, he was speaking about something else.

But I return to my specific question: Would not this purchase of time, on which it is argued we should make a downpayment here, have the effect of legislatures unconstitutionally organized being legitimized?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Perhaps so. This is an enforced condition created by one branch of the Government. All we are trying to do is to say, "You have done it in such a hurry that you have made it impossible to come back with a remedy. You have made it impossible to get a constitutional amendment to meet your challenge to this jurisdiction and the other States that do not agree."

If not so, why should 30 States be so openly hostile to this decision? And why should the people be emotionally wrought up and be thinking about judicial oligarchy and judicial arrogance?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1219 THROUGH 1228

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask to have printed, 10 amendments which I intend to propose to the pending amendment at the appropriate time.

I ask unanimous consent that the so-called Dirksen "rotten borough" amendment may be printed at this point in the RECORD, to be followed by the text of each of my 10 amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

The amendment, No. 1215, submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) is as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 1215

On page 17, after line 7, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 402. (a) Chapter 21, title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 461. Stay of proceedings for reapportionment of State legislative bodies

"(a) Any court of the United States having jurisdiction of an action in which the constitutionality of the apportionment of representation in a State legislature or either house thereof is drawn in question shall, upon application, stay the entry or execution of any order interfering with the conduct of the State government, the proceedings of any house of the legislature thereof, or of any convention, primary, or election, for such period as will be in the public interest.

"(b) A stay for the period necessary—
"(1) to permit any State election of representatives occurring before January 1, 1966, to be conducted in accordance with the laws of such State in effect immediately preceding any adjudication of unconstitutionality and

"(2) to allow the legislature of such State a reasonable opportunity in regular session or the people by constitutional amendment a reasonable opportunity fol-

lowing the adjudication of unconstitutionality to apportion representation in such legislature in accordance with the Constitution

shall be deemed to be in the public interest in the absence of highly unusual circumstances.

"(c) An application for a stay pursuant to this section may be filed at any time before or after final judgment by any party or intervenor in the action, by the State, or by the Governor or attorney general or any member of the legislature thereof without other authority.

"(d) In the event that a State fails to apportion representation in the legislature in accordance with the Constitution within the time allowed by any stay granted pursuant to this section, the district court having jurisdiction of the action shall apportion representation in such legislature among appropriate districts so as to conform to the constitution and laws of such State insofar as is possible consistent with the requirements of the Constitution of the United States, and the court may make such further orders pertaining thereto and to the conduct of elections as may be appropriate.

"(e) An order of a district court of three judges granting or denying a stay shall be appealable to the Supreme Court in the manner provided under section 1253 of this title, and in all other cases shall be appealable to the court of appeals in the manner provided under section 1294 of this title. Pending the disposition of such appeal the Supreme Court or a Justice thereof, or the court of appeals or a judge thereof, shall have power to stay the order of the district court or to grant or deny a stay in accordance with subsections (a) and (b).

"(b) The chapter analysis of that chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"461. Stay of proceedings for reapportionment of State legislative bodies."

The amendments submitted by Mr. CLARK are as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 1219

On page 2, line 18, strike out the words "before or".

On page 2, line 19, strike out the words "or intervenor".

On page 2, lines 20 and 21, strike out the words "or any member of the legislature thereof without other authority".

AMENDMENT No. 1220

On page 2, line 10, immediately after the word "or", insert a comma and the following: "if the order held a provision of the State constitution invalid."

AMENDMENT No. 1221

On page 2, line 10, immediately after the word "session", insert the words "convened after the entry of such order".

AMENDMENT No. 1222

On page 2, line 10, immediately after the word "in", insert the word "the".

AMENDMENT No. 1223

On page 2, line 7, immediately after the word "unconstitutionality", insert the words "rendered subsequent to June 1, 1964".

AMENDMENT No. 1224

On page 2, line 5, strike out "January 1, 1966", and insert in lieu thereof "January 1, 1965".

AMENDMENT No. 1225

On page 2, line 4, strike out the word "representatives", and insert in lieu thereof the words "members of the upper house".

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18847

AMENDMENT No. 1226

On page 2, line 2, immediately after the words "such period as", insert the words "the court may determine".

AMENDMENT No. 1227

On page 1, line 8, immediately after the word "in", insert the words "the upper house of".

On page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "or either house thereof".

On page 1, line 11, strike out the word "any", and insert in lieu thereof the word "such".

AMENDMENT No. 1228

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "shall", and insert in lieu thereof the word "may".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I did not quite hear the last statement of the distinguished Senator about his amendments.

Mr. CLARK. I did not hear the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought the Senator said something about having 10 amendments.

Mr. CLARK. I did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Are they 10 amendments to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment?

Mr. CLARK. They are amendments to what I prefer to refer to as the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Dirksen amendment?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am grateful for that statement. But this is a joint sponsorship by the very distinguished majority leader and a humble servant—myself.

Mr. CLARK. I was thinking it was a rather reluctant marriage.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would like to reply to my colleague. I rise in opposition to his amendment. I do that in no unfriendly spirit whatsoever.

My colleague and I have until recently seldom voted together, but we have had most pleasant personal relations. He has always been friendly and courteous to me. And I have tried to be friendly and courteous to him. There is no personal animus in the position which I take. But this is a very serious question—I think perhaps the most serious issue which has come before the Senate this year.

DIRKSEN AMENDMENT WOULD FREEZE PRESENT APPORTIONMENTS FOR INDETERMINATE TIME

In effect, what the amendment of my colleague would do would be to freeze the present apportionment of the State legislatures for an indeterminate period of time.

As my colleague has stated, during the period of the freeze a constitutional amendment, if passed by the House and Senate by a two-thirds vote, would be submitted to the legislatures of the various States for ratification. The terms of the amendment would then permanently freeze the legislatures of the various States in their present unrepresentative character. Therefore, the objective of the Dirksen amendment is to assure that the grossly unrepresentative legis-

latures would pass upon the constitutional amendment which would prevent the Supreme Court from ever changing the situation or ever producing a reapportionment more in accordance with population.

Therefore, my friend and colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], was quite correct when he labeled the amendment the "rotten borough" amendment, because the practical effect of it—and, I am sorry to say, I believe the intention—would be to freeze the State legislatures in their present unrepresentative character and prevent the Supreme Court from invoking the provision for the equal protection of the laws to provide substantially equal—not precisely equal, but substantially equal—representation in the State legislatures.

We should realize that the present proposal is merely a forerunner of a constitutional amendment which, if its proponents can get it through in the form they most desire, would forbid the Supreme Court or any Federal court from ordering redistricting. In effect, this would permit the present malapportioned State legislatures quickly to ratify such an amendment and thus freeze forever, or for a long period of time, the present unjust system, which denies to both cities and suburbs—and I emphasize that point—their fair representation in the State legislatures, and continues them as vassals of the over-represented rural areas, with a denial in most cases of the full rights of home rule.

PROCEDURES BEING FOLLOWED ARE HIGHLY DUBIOUS AND IRREGULAR

Mr. President, there are many dubious features of the procedural manner in which such a highly important proposal making possible fundamental changes in our constitutional structure is being advanced.

First, I point out that the forerunner of the amendment was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary after only a brief, informal discussion, without members of the public being permitted to testify. There were no public hearings. There could be no sifting of points of view.

Second, as the Senator from Arkansas has suggested, the amendment is improperly proposed as a rider to the foreign aid bill, which deals with a totally separate matter.

The proposal comes at the end of the session, when the Senate has an overloaded and crowded calendar and we are in the last few days compelled to deal with a multitude of issues which we could not deal with before because of the 90-day filibuster on the civil rights bill. There is not sufficient time for the discussion of the Dirksen measure, which goes to the very fundamentals of the American system of government.

The preliminary amendment was presented by the Senator from Illinois several days ago. Suddenly today there was sprung upon us a revision of that amendment, the full nature of which we have not had time to discuss.

Third, if the amendment were adopted as a rider to the foreign assistance bill,

It would become very difficult for the President to deal with the measure upon its merits. It would be very difficult for him to veto the proposal if he should disapprove of it, because it would be included in a vital bill. That would remove the possibility of a Presidential veto, or would greatly diminish it.

We sometimes forget that the Presidential veto was designed by the framers of the Constitution as an integral part of the legislative process. It was not intended as something separate and distinct from legislative process. The possibility of the veto was considered to be a vital part of the legislative process.

Fourth, as the Senator from Michigan has stated, the amendment would amount to Congress suspending completely an interpretation of the Constitution by the Supreme Court. It would deny the operation of a constitutional process to individuals and to States during that period. So far as I know, that has been done only once before in the entire history of the Nation, namely, in the Reconstruction period after the Civil War, when there was a great dispute between the Supreme Court and the majority of the Congress about the Reconstruction policies which could be followed under the Constitution.

My colleague has stated that the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, now believes that the present amendment is constitutional. I am not responsible for Mr. Katzenbach's opinion; I do not know that he has officially made the statement. I am frank to say that if he did make such a statement, it would not necessarily be controlling in any sense.

People select constitutional opinions which they like. My colleague quoted the minority opinion of Justice Harlan and seemed to think that that was a correct interpretation of the Constitution. He did not quote the majority opinion, which was handed down in three decisions—in the case of Baker against Carr, in the Reynolds case, and in the Colorado case, all of which came to a contrary conclusion. In these decisions the Court maintained that the phrase "the equal protection of the laws" embodied in the Constitution imposes an obligation upon the States to give to their citizens approximately equal representation in the legislature. If people are unequally represented, they cannot be said to have the equal protection of the laws.

Personally I believe that that is a sound point of view. I accept, as do many people in this country not wholly ignorant on the question, the doctrine that the decisions of the Supreme Court are correct in law; and certainly I believe that in these cases they are correct in substance.

THE AMENDMENT WOULD SUSPEND THE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS

I believe that what we are asked to do is to suspend for an indetermined time the constitutional guarantee of the equal protection of the law, and to deny this protection to individuals who may wish to obtain it.

My colleague said that he wished to explain tomorrow what his amendment meant. He did not do so tonight. I hope that I am not poaching upon his ground if I say that the vital section seems to be section 402(b). On page 2 of the amendment we find that it would apparently do two things. First, it would provide that there shall be no change in apportionment in any State election of representatives prior to the first of January 1966.

Therefore, it would freeze elections to come in the near future.

In the second part of subsection (b), it is provided that there shall be—

"A stay for the period necessary—

"(i) to allow the legislature of such State a reasonable opportunity in regular session or the people by constitutional amendment a reasonable opportunity following the adjudication of unconstitutionality to apportion representation in such legislature in accordance with the Constitution

THE AMENDMENT WOULD ESTABLISH INDEFINITE DELAY

I ask Senators to notice two things. First, there must be a constitutional decision, and presumably that would require ultimate decisions by the Supreme Court, and not merely decisions by lower courts. Grounds for differences and differentiation between the cases that are brought up and the previous Tennessee, Alabama, and Colorado cases can always be found, so that each case can be presented as being a fresh issue. Then after this occurs the legislature of such State is to be given "a reasonable opportunity in regular session or the people by constitutional amendment a reasonable opportunity"—

Then I skip the adjudication question and come to the concluding words "to apportion representation in such legislature in accordance with the Constitution."

This provides a delay of an indeterminate duration. It is not limited to 1 year, as the press reports seemed to indicate earlier in the day. It is highly indefinite. Who can say what is a "reasonable opportunity"?

In 1955, the Supreme Court, in the second civil rights case, held that desegregation should proceed "with all deliberate speed." That was 9 years ago, and after 9 years these cases are still being fought. "Deliberate speed" was a very vague phrase. "Reasonable opportunity" is a very vague phrase. So for an indeterminate period, we may freeze the State legislatures in their present unrepresentative positions.

This brings us back to the point from which I started; namely, that my colleague and those who agree with him have openly stated that they plan to propose an amendment, again in January, when the new Congress meets, to amend the Constitution so that either reapportionment will not proceed, or the Supreme Court and other Federal courts will have no power to order reapportionment.

Indeed, they may not have to wait for congressional action, because there is already pending before the legislatures of the States one of the three so-called disunity amendments which were submitted to the States by the so-called General

Assembly of the States after representatives of the State legislatures met at the call of the Council of State Governments in Chicago in 1962. This assembly proposed three amendments, one of which proposed to set up a super Supreme Court composed of the chief justices of the 50 States in the Union, which would review basic decisions of the Supreme Court dealing with the relationships between the Federal Government and the States.

I believe that proposed amendment was one of the most irresponsible ideas that has ever sprung from the mind of man.

But there was also one which stated that the Supreme Court was to have no power over ordering the apportionment of seats in the State legislatures.

Fourteen State legislatures have approved resolutions applying to the Congress—under the hitherto unused amendment procedure authorized by article V—for the calling of a constitutional convention to act on this proposal. The constitutionality of one ratification; namely, that of Nebraska, is dubious, however. This amendment has also been approved by one house or the other in six additional States.

This may be the vehicle which the opponents of judicial control over reapportionment may use; and if so, they have a good head start since they have from 12 to 14 applications already, and favoring amendments in 1 house of 6 additional legislatures.

I think I have said enough to indicate that this is a very grave issue.

I do not know what the intentions of the majority and minority leaders are. I had thought that I would like to follow the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who really did not discuss the issue appreciably. He has said he will postpone his discussion until tomorrow. I would prefer to have the major thrust of my argument come after his. I have quite a long speech prepared. I can speak for several hours. I am ready to do it if necessary, but I would prefer to have unanimous consent to have this speech not count as one speech and be permitted to continue tomorrow after the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has made his explanation of what his amendment really means.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that this speech may not be considered as one speech on this measure and that I may be permitted to continue my speech tomorrow following the speech of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would mind offering the amendment proposed by his colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and several others, which is the objective for which the delay period is being asked, made a part of his remarks before he asks unanimous consent?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was about to present his own amendment, but apparently he is not. The Senator

from Florida asked for the printing of the Dirksen amendment. Is the Senator referring to the amendment suggested in Chicago in 1962?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. I am referring to the amendment that was offered in the Senate a few days ago by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and a number of other Senators, including myself, which is the objective for which the delay period is being asked.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I always thought it was the function of the proponents to insert the necessary documents in the Record. If the Senator from Florida requests it, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to which he refers, proposed by the junior Senator from Illinois and other Members of the Senate, be printed. And then I shall renew my earlier request.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very happy to have that done.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 185) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Except as otherwise provided by this article the citizens of each State shall have exclusive power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof, and such power shall not be infringed nor the exercise thereof be reviewed in an original action or on appeal or controlled by the United States or any branch of the Government thereof. The membership of at least one house of the legislature of each State shall be apportioned as nearly equally as possible according to the number of persons determined by the enumeration provided in article I, section 2, or if there is only one house of the legislature then upon such combination of population and area as the citizens of the State shall determine.

"Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not anticipate this kind of request. I wonder if the Senator would reserve it until I have an opportunity to confer with the majority leader?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the Senator is going to have printed as a part of his remarks the proposed constitutional amendment offered by his colleague [Mr. DIRKSEN] and others of us, and which I am saying for the Record is the objective in connection with the legislation now pending?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a very frank statement. I have asked to have it printed. I wish to add, however, that several other constitutional amendments

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18849

on this issue—perhaps more objectionable ones—have been proposed and are being considered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I express my appreciation to the Senator from Illinois.

I have no objection to his request, though I think the Senator from Arkansas has made an appropriate suggestion that the leadership be conferred with before the order is entered. I personally have no objection.

THE ROTTEN BOROUGH AMENDMENT IS WRONG
IN SUBSTANCE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me again refer to the "rotten borough" amendment.

I want to lay major stress on my opposition to the present Dirksen amendment on substantive rather than procedural grounds. I have been talking about procedure up to this time, but my basic objections are substantive. I want to stress that the apportionment of State legislatures was and is in general disproportionate and unfair, and would deny to the cities and the suburbs, which now comprise nearly 65 percent of the population of the country, and which in a few years will comprise 70 percent, then 75 percent and, in the not-to-distant future, 80 percent of the population of this country, their fair and proportionate share of representation in State legislatures. As a derivative, indeed it would deny proper representation in the National House of Representatives, since the congressional districts are laid out by the State legislatures; and an unrepresentative State legislature is likely to lay out unrepresentative congressional districts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator knows, does he not, that the constitutional amendment proposed by his distinguished colleague from Illinois and others has no reference to staying the hand of the Supreme Court or the Federal judiciary with respect to their jurisdiction with reference to the districts for the election of Members of the House of Representatives?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Whether that is the objective can be made evident in the future. The rotten borough amendment would freeze the present malapportionment in the State legislatures and, I believe, a constitutional amendment will then be pushed to continue the freeze indefinitely. This situation has already led to malapportionment of congressional districts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe it would be appropriate at this stage for me to say, that the proposed constitutional amendment would not freeze the membership in both houses of the State legislature, but it would provide that only as to one house, if a State so determines, the membership of that house may be elected upon a basis that recognizes other factors than population. The other house must have its membership based solely on population.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The proposals have been changed almost every day. We do

not know what is coming up the next day. We do not know what is going to be the proposal in January. I will deal with this question in a little while.

To state the matter again, the present Dirksen amendment is an attempt to enable the present malapportioned State legislatures to ratify a forthcoming constitutional amendment to freeze for an interminably long period of time the present unfair system; and that would be done by State legislatures which are adjudged unconstitutionally created because they violate the 14th amendment. It would permit unconstitutionally created State legislatures to perpetuate themselves through ratifying a constitutional amendment.

PRESENT LEGISLATURES WOULD BE BIASED JURIES

I do not object to a constitutional amendment being put up to a fairly constituted set of State legislatures in which the members are reasonably distributed, and without an appreciable conflict of interest. But here they would be interested parties, who naturally would not in the main wish to have themselves reapportioned out of their jobs, or to give up their control over the cities. Hence, with certain honorable exceptions, they would tend to jump at the chance of freezing themselves into their jobs. This would amount to sending the amendment before a biased set of jurors. Legislatures have not in the main basically reapportioned themselves in the past, except under judicial compulsion, as in the past 2 years, and as under the Baker against Carr decision and the Alabama and Colorado decisions. There is little prospect that they would do so in the future.

I take it that the majority leader is being consulted as to whether or not he wishes to have this speech counted as a first speech. In default of that, I shall continue.

ORIGINALLY IN AN AGRICULTURAL AGE, THE
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS WERE SUBSTANTIALLY
JUST

When State legislative districts were originally laid out, they were in the main substantially fair and just. I know that there were variations. I know that the tidewater counties of Virginia, for example, discriminated against the up-country counties. I know that in Pennsylvania the counties around Philadelphia discriminated against the Scotch-Irish counties on the frontier.

In the main, however, the legislative districts were approximately equal. This was true because we were primarily a rural and agricultural country, and the population was more or less evenly spread over the area of a State, with very few cities, and evenly distributed small towns. The small towns were the trading centers serving the adjoining countryside. Here would be found the handicraftsmen, like blacksmiths, shoemakers, barbers, tailors, and coopers as well as the small stores. Generally, the small towns were located approximately 1 hour's travel from the farthest farm in the trading area. In the days of the horse and buggy 6 to 7½ miles distance on one side, plus 6 to 7½ miles on the other side, tended to determine the location of towns. That is why towns were

located 12 to 15 miles apart. In laying out the counties, it was generally provided that a person would not have to take more than half a day to get to the county seat and a half day to come from the county seat, allowing some time to conduct business while there.

Therefore counties tended to be roughly 30 by 30 miles in extent, with the county seat in the center of the county, 12 to 15 miles from the nearest points on the border of the county.

Those were rough rules. Some counties were smaller and some larger. In Texas, they were much larger, of course.

BUT TIME BROUGHT VITAL SHIFTS OF POPULATION
TOWARD THE CITIES

In the course of time, as we all know, manufacturing developed, and with it the concentration of population. Transportation brought concentration, mining brought concentration, and nation-wide selling agencies, nation-wide banks, nation-wide newspapers and publishing organizations all brought centralization of population and the growth of the cities and, more recently, the suburbs. All this has multiplied apace.

I do not wish to labor the issue, but there are certain facts which are extremely striking. In 1790, when George Washington was President, there were only two cities in this country which had a population of more than 25,000. They were New York and Philadelphia. They each had less than 50,000 people. In 1830, 40 years later, there was only one city with a population of more than 100,000, and only 3 with populations between 50,000 and 100,000.

Now let us skip to the Civil War. At the beginning of the Civil War, there were 2 cities—again New York and Philadelphia—with populations of from half a million to 1 million; one from a quarter of a million to a half a million; and 6 from 100,000 to 250,000. There were 9 cities with a population of over 100,000.

Let us see what had happened by 1880.

In 1880 one city had risen above a million. That was New York. Three had populations of from 500,000 to 1 million. Four cities had populations of from 250,000 to 500,000, and 12 cities had populations of from 100,000 to 250,000.

By 1900 3 cities had populations of over 1 million. Those cities were New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago. Three cities had populations of from 500,000 to 1 million. Nine cities had populations of from 250,000 to 500,000. Twenty-three cities had populations of from 100,000 to 250,000. That made a total of 38 cities in 1900 with populations of over 100,000.

In 1910, there were still 3 cities with populations of over 1 million; 5 had populations of from 500,000 to 1 million; 11 cities had populations of from 250,000 to 500,000; 31 cities had populations of from 100,000 to 250,000; that made a total of 50 cities that had populations of over 100,000.

Let us see what the situation was 20 years later, in 1930. There were 5 cities of over 1 million, 8 over 500,000 to 1 million, 24 over 250,000 to 500,000, and 56 over 100,000 to 250,000. That made a

total of 93 cities of over 100,000 people.

Now let us take 1950. There were still 5 cities having a population of more than 1 million, although the population of each city had increased; 13, not 8, having a population from 500,000 to 1 million; 23 having a population from 250,000 to 500,000; 65 having a population from 100,000 to 250,000; or 106 cities having populations of more than 100,000, as compared with 9 in 1860, 12 in 1880, 38 in 1900, and 50 in 1910.

Let us take the last census. There were still 5 cities having more than a million population; 16 having from 500,000 to 1 million; 29 from 250,000 to 500,000; 81 from 100,000 to 250,000; or a total of 131 cities having populations of more than 100,000.

Now let us consider the current population of some of the cities. New York, in 1960, had a population inside the corporate limits, not including the suburbs, of 7,781,000; Chicago, 3,550,000; Philadelphia, 2,002,000; Detroit, 1,670,000; Los Angeles, 2,479,000. Los Angeles is very expansive, so it likes to include Long Beach in its population. If that is done, the total population is 2,823,000.

Baltimore, inside the city limits, had 939,000; San Francisco, 740,000. In keeping with the expansive ideas of California, San Francisco likes to include Oakland's population. If that is done, the total population is 1,003,000.

San Diego, which I knew when its population was about 100,000, now has a population of 573,000.

The other large cities had these populations in 1960: Cleveland, 876,000; St. Louis, 750,000; Milwaukee, 741,000; Boston, 697,000; Pittsburgh, 604,000; Seattle, 557,000; Cincinnati, 502,000; Atlanta, 487,000; Birmingham, 340,000; Indianapolis, 476,000; Phoenix, the City in the Sun, which has expanded at a geometric rate, aided by Government-furnished water at the general taxpayers' expense, 439,000; Honolulu, 294,000 in the central city, but including the suburbs of Honolulu, close to half a million; Houston, 938,000; Dallas, 679,000; San Antonio, 588,000; Fort Worth, the last of the big 4 cities of Texas, 356,000.

The old America, which we loved has, with the passage of time, largely disappeared. I grew up in rural America, as I presume the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. McINTYRE in the chair] did. In my youth I read Longfellow's "The Village Blacksmith," which has very appropriate, because in the small town in which I grew up the village blacksmith did work, and he worked under a spreading chestnut tree. He hammered out horseshoes with which he shod the horses of the farmers and the townspeople.

We knew everybody in town, and they knew us. I liked that sort of life. I still like it. I like to go back into it periodically. It has many virtues. The close relationships the people have to one another are, at times, possibly too close. Possibly we knew too much about the neighbors, and they knew too much about us. But on the whole, it was a very warm, intimate relationship.

But that is an America which, instead of being predominant, is now in the

distinct minority. We know this in general, but sometimes we do not realize the full extent to which life and developments have gone.

A great many people who are acting as legislators in the State legislatures—and, indeed, in Congress—still think of this country as a place of the village blacksmith under the spreading chestnut tree, with the sparks flying from the horseshoe being beaten upon the anvil. They think of the foreign relations of the United States as they were in the days when there was a monthly boat from Boston to Liverpool. That is their idea of America. It is difficult to correct their ideas and to bring their thoughts and emotions up to the actual events.

We have become primarily a nation of large cities. I have not mentioned all the cities having populations of more than 500,000, nor have I mentioned many cities having populations under 500,000. For example, in the State of Ohio there is not only the great metropolis of Cleveland, from which come the two distinguished Senators from Ohio; but there is a bevy of smaller cities, including Cincinnati, Columbus, Toledo, Akron, Dayton, Zanesville, and Youngstown.

In New York there is not only New York City; there are Buffalo, Albany, and the chain of cities along the old Erie Canal—Rome, which used to be called out on the New York Central; Utica, Syracuse, Rochester, and so on.

In the State of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE], who now graces the chair of the Presiding Officer, are the larger cities of Nashua and Manchester, which are very different from Keene and the other smaller communities in New Hampshire.

In Pennsylvania, the State so well represented by its senior Senator [Mr. CLARK], there are not only the giant metropolises at the eastern and western ends of that State, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, but there are the intermediate cities of Harrisburg, Altoona, Williamsport, and Scranton—about which we have heard recently—Wilkes-Barre, Allentown, and Bethlehem—Bethlehem, first founded by the gentle Moravians, and which became one of the world's greatest armorers, and producers of munitions.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Bethlehem is also the home of the famous Bach Choir, which is one of the great cultural assets of our Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is one of the gifts of the Moravians not only to the city of Bethlehem and the State of Pennsylvania, but to the country, as well.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. One can hear the oratorios of Bach along with the clanging machinery.

Mr. CLARK. Sometimes, if the Senator from Illinois will permit the interruption, the sweet music of the Moravians speaks more loudly for peace on earth and good will toward men than the clanging of the machinery of the munitions makers, important as that is, as

the Senator knows, as an ex-marine, in the interest of our national security.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Moravians, though few in number, have had a strong permeative influence on the country. They founded the city of Salem, which now forms the second part of the city of Winston-Salem in North Carolina. I think they would somewhat regret the fact that they also have given its name to the Salem cigarette.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is making a most important address. I hope it will be read more carefully than it is presently being listened to, in view of the usual status of the Chamber at this hour of the afternoon.

However, I should like to point out, since the Senator has mentioned the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, that there is no crisis, no chaos in connection with reapportionment in our State. Both parties are in accord on a sensible procedure for remedying the unconstitutional inequity which was so well pointed out by Chief Justice Warren in the wonderful decision which he handed down on June 15 in the Reynolds case.

So we have already had a three-judge court declare our reapportionment—which was instituted, really, in the interest of a Republican gerrymander—unconstitutional. The decree of the court has been stayed until after the 1964 election, as was suggested by Chief Justice Warren in the 10th part of that magnificent opinion. It might be in order to prevent the crisis of chaos upon which the Senator from Illinois laid such stress earlier.

The Republican Governor of our State has agreed to call the legislature into session early in 1965. It will be a regular session. I have every reason to believe that equitable reapportionment of both houses of the legislature will then take place.

There is no panic in Pennsylvania except on the conservative Republican side. They see themselves about to lose their illegal control over the State senate, and to some extent the State house. I was told by the former Governor of our State, a man who knows the State as well as does anyone alive today, former Governor David L. Lawrence, that the Democrats could carry the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by a majority of 600,000 this fall and still not control the State senate or the State legislature—which to my mind makes it all the more important that the "rotten borough" amendment should be defeated.

(At this point, Mr. SALINGER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

NO CHAOS AS THE RESULT OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. There is no chaos in Illinois, either. The elections for the State senate will proceed in an orderly manner. The present 58 districts will be used in the November 1964, election.

It is true that the election to the lower house in the State legislature will be at large with 118 of the 177 members named by each party, so that no party will have

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18851

more than 118 seats. But this election at large was not required by any decision of the Supreme Court, or any Federal court. It came about under provisions of the Illinois Constitution because of the decision of the Illinois State courts, difficulties in the Illinois Legislature, and disagreements between the legislature and the Governor—in which, incidentally, I believe the Governor was completely in the right. But no trouble or chaos has been caused in Illinois by decisions of U.S. courts.

POPULATION IN THE CENTRAL CITIES OVER MOST OF THE COUNTIES HERE RECENTLY WELCOMED—IT IS THE SUBURBS WHICH HAVE GROWN

The statistics I have cited so far tell only a part of the story. What has happened in the past few years has been a decrease in the size of the population living in the central cities over most of the country, and a great increase in population in adjoining suburbs. The Census Bureau has therefore adopted as a measurable unit what are properly termed "metropolitan districts," rather than corporate entities, as the best judge of population density.

These suburban districts are areas where a major portion of the wage earners and salaried workers commute to work in the central cities, or as is increasingly the case, in peripheral manufacturing and other enterprises closely tied to the central cities.

But the interests of the suburbs are vitally connected to the central cities with respect to transportation, water supply, sanitation, smoke abatement, control over fires, police, coordination of streets and highways, zoning, taxation, and the like.

Virtually the entire growth of the country from 1950 to 1960 occurred in the suburbs. The open country lost population. The number of farmers diminished. The big cities, in the main, lost population, with the exception of the cities on or near the Gulf of Mexico—such as the Miami-Tampa-New Orleans—the Houston complex; the cities of the sun, in New Mexico and Arizona; and in southern California, Los Angeles, and San Diego. But the major cities of the East and of the Midwest lost population.

In my city of Chicago, the population diminished from 3,629,000 to 3,550,000—a population loss of 2 percent.

The city of Pittsburgh fell from 679,000 to 604,000—a loss of 11 percent.

The city of St. Louis diminished from a population of 857,000 to 750,000—a 13-percent loss.

Boston, which used to regard itself as the hub of the universe, diminished from 801,000 to 679,000—a loss of 13 percent.

The corporate city of New York diminished from 7,891,000 to 7,781,000—a loss of 110,000, or approximately 1¼ percent.

Philadelphia fell in population from 2,071,000 to 2,002,000, or a loss of 3½ percent.

Nevertheless, in 1960, cities with a population of over 1 million—5 of them—had 9.8 percent of the population of the country, or approximately 10 percent.

Cities over 500,000, including those over a million, had 15.9 percent of the population of the country—approximately 16 percent, or roughly one-sixth of the population of the country.

Cities over 250,000 had 21.9 percent of the population of the country—approximately 22 percent, or two-ninths of the population of the country.

Cities over 100,000 had 28.4 percent, or over a quarter of the population of the country.

Cities over 50,000 had 36.4 percent of the population of the country.

Cities over 25,000 had 44 percent of the population of the country.

The suburban trend has progressed to the point where, taken as a whole, the suburbs probably now have more people than do the central cities.

For example, take New York, with 7,781,000 people in the central city and 2,912,000 outside the central city—in Westchester, Suffolk and Nassau Counties—or a total of 10,684,000. If we include the overlap in the New York metropolitan area in the New Jersey communities, on the other side of the Hudson River, and do not include Connecticut, or such places as Westport, we have 14,759,000 in the New York metropolitan area.

It is accurate to say that there are 15 million people in the New York metropolitan area, of whom approximately one-half live outside the city of New York.

In Chicago, as I have stated, there are 3,550,000 in the central city, but 2,670,000 live outside the central city, inside Illinois—namely, in the counties of Lake, Will, Du Page, Kane, and McHenry. If I include Gary, East Chicago, and the Hammond area close at hand on the lake in Indiana, we obtain a total figure of approximately 6,800,000 in the metropolitan area of Chicago.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER] in the chair. He waged a strenuous campaign in California. It is not news to him that while there are 2,833,000 people inside the corporate limits of Los Angeles, there are 3,919,000 people outside the central city in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, or a total of 6,742,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. These figures are obtained by Los Angeles annexing Long Beach. We felt that if it was fair for Long Beach to be counted with Los Angeles, we should count Gary, East Chicago, and Hammond. If those are included, Chicago is still the second largest metropolitan area in the country. Los Angeles must take a back seat.

Philadelphia, Pa., has 2,002,000 in the central city, but 2,340,000 in the suburban area, or 4,243,000 in the metropolitan area.

No life is more pleasant than the life along the main line of Philadelphia. If one goes down the Swarthmore branch, it is very pleasant there, or if one turns northward. The Philadelphia suburbs are perhaps the most pleasant in the country. I shall not make any comments about the intellectual level of the Philadelphia suburbs, lest I offend my dear colleague from Pennsylvania. That does

not include the suburban areas near Philadelphia, on the Delaware River, Morrisville, Haddonfield, and the other areas. I believe perhaps Philadelphia has at least 5 million people who regard it as the trading and cultural center.

Detroit, with 1,670,000 people inside the city, and 2,092,000 outside the city, has a total metropolitan population of 3,762,000. And they do not have to claim Windsor, in Ontario, Canada, in getting that figure.

THE STRIKING CASE OF MARYLAND

Baltimore has 939,000 in the city, and 787,000 people outside of the central city. The total is 1,727,000. When we come to the representation figures for Baltimore, we shall find something interesting.

There are nine little counties on the Eastern Shore, each one with a senator. Their total population is about 220,000. They have nine senators. The county of Baltimore, with a population of 550,000 has but one senator. One county on the Eastern Shore—I am not quite certain whether it is Calvert or Somerset County—has 15,000 people. It has a senator. But Baltimore County, with a population of 550,000, has only one senator. It requires 37 people in the county of Baltimore to have the same representation as 1 person in either Calvert or Somerset County.

Two hundred and twenty thousand people on the Eastern Shore have 9 times the representation of the 550,000 people in the county of Baltimore.

Take the other two big counties in Maryland—Montgomery, which is just to the north of us, and Prince Georges, to the northeast of us. Montgomery County has approximately 340,000 people. It has one senator.

Prince Georges County has approximately 360,000 people. It has one senator.

Add Baltimore County, Montgomery County, and Prince Georges County together, and we get a total of 1¼ million people, with three senators. And the nine little counties on the Eastern Shore, with only about one-sixth of the population, have three times the representation. That is why the Eastern Shore tends to control the Maryland Legislature.

If the 9 Senators are banded together, as they are, they can make alliances and can control 16 votes—the majority of the Maryland Senate.

Maryland is largely controlled by the overrepresented Eastern Shore. That is one of the great difficulties that Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, Baltimore City, or Baltimore County have in getting legislation through.

Maryland is a State which lies just at our gates. It is characterized by gross malrepresentation. I see sardonic smiles from some of the onlookers. I say that is an abuse of representative government.

WHAT ABOUT CALIFORNIA?

Let me turn to California. I shall produce more detailed evidence on this tomorrow. The county of Los Angeles has over 6 million people. It has one senator. There is one county, or one senatorial district, in California with a population of approximately 14,000 which has 1 senator. One voter in this

18852

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

mountain senatorial district has the same effect as approximately 457 voters inside the county of Los Angeles. These are examples of what is occurring all over the Nation.

I have some detailed figures which I shall present tomorrow when I am able to present my argument in more detail and at greater length than I am able to do tonight. But this can do for a starter.

Mr. President, I recommend the U.S. census to all students of politics. It is a very revealing book. It gives a great deal of information.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three tables based on the census of population showing the 1960 and the 1950 populations inside and outside central cities of standard metropolitan statistical areas, and in their component counties, plus a table for the major SMSA's, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 1.)

THE BALANCE BETWEEN CITIES AND SUBURBS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in brief, in 216 urban areas of this country, there are 115,800,000 people, which—with a national population of 178 million—amounts to well over 60 percent of the total population in the Nation. Of this amount, 58.4 million are in the central cities, and 57.4 million live just outside of the central cities. The cities and suburbs are approximately even.

Since 1960, there has, of course, been a continuation of this same shift in population, so that today it is undoubtedly true there are more people living in the metropolitan areas outside the central cities than inside the central cities.

Between 1950 and 1960, the population of the central cities increased by 11 percent. The outside communities increased by 47 percent. The city increase, as I have mentioned, was mainly in certain specified areas of the country, where there is a great deal of sun—Florida, Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, southern California. There was no increase in the East and in the Midwest, except in isolated cases.

Mr. President, thus far I have been discussing the concentration of population in cities and metropolitan areas, including both cities and suburbs.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY COUNTIES

The census also gives a classification by counties and by size. These figures have been well assembled by Prof. Paul David and Ralph Eisenberg of the highly conservative University of Virginia at Charlottesville. But, some of their research may have been done under other auspices.

On page 8 of their study they have figures on how the small counties and the large counties have been faring in the past 50 years.

Let us consider counties with populations under 25,000. In 1910 there were 2,149 of them. They had a total population of 27.2 million. In 1930 the number had diminished very slightly to 2,062, but their population had gone down by a million to 26,331,000.

In 1950 their population fell again to 24,261,000.

In 1960 their population fell once more to 23,064,000.

While the country was almost doubling in population, the population of these counties, comprising approximately two-thirds of the counties in the Nation, had diminished from 27,400,000 to 23 million, or a decline of 4,400,000, or about 16 percent.

Let us compare the counties with populations of over 500,000. In 1910 there were only 15 of them. They had 14.8 million people.

In 1930, the number increased to 23, and the population to 28.6 million.

In 1950, the number rose again to 41, and the population to 44,800,000.

In 1960, there were 64 of them; the population was 65.7 million. There had been an increase of 4½ times in the population of those counties in 50 years, or an increase of about 350 percent, while the small counties, those under 25,000 in population, were diminishing by about 14 or 15 percent.

A county with a population of from 100,000 to one-half million is a large county. There were 87 of those in 1910. They had a population of 17.1 million

people. By 1930, their number increased to 142 and their population to 29.9 million people.

In 1950, there were 200 of them, with 40.1 million people.

In 1960, there were 238 of them—almost three times the number in 1910—with a total population of 48.5 million.

If we add all the counties with populations of 100,000 or more, in both of those groups, we get a total of 302 counties in 1960 with a total population of 114 million people out of the 178 million people in the country at that time. This was 64 percent of the total.

Need anything more be said to show that we have become an urban nation, a nation of large cities and their affiliated suburbs, a nation of large counties?

I ask unanimous consent that the table from page 8 of the study by Paul David and Ralph Eisenberg, "Devaluation of the Urban and Suburban Vote," be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number and population of counties in the United States, grouped by categories of population size, 1910, 1930, 1950, and 1960¹

[Population in thousands]

Categories	1910		1930		1950		1960	
	Number	Population	Number	Population	Number	Population	Number	Population
Under 25,000.....	2,149	27,421	2,062	26,331	1,954	24,261	1,942	23,064
25,000 to 99,999.....	796	32,203	869	37,411	901	40,757	884	41,247
100,000 to 499,999.....	87	17,154	142	29,911	200	40,088	238	48,542
500,000 and over.....	15	14,853	23	28,634	41	44,789	64	65,705
Total.....	3,047	91,632	3,096	122,288	3,096	149,895	3,128	178,558

¹ Independent cities not contained within a county, such as exist in a few States, are treated as counties and are included in the above tabulations. The District of Columbia, which is not a part of any State and which had no locally elective legislative representation in any of the years studied, is omitted from this table. Totals include only areas with representation in State legislatures.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is performing a great service to the country by spelling out in clear detail exactly what are the real social and economic problems behind the whole reapportionment struggle.

I ask him if it is not true that, in the absence of population reapportionment, there will continue to be inaction in State legislature after State legislature and refusal in many States, on the basis of experience which goes back many years, to cope with the problems of urban and suburban areas, with the result that there will be great pressure on Washington to do the job that should be done on a local level? Is that not true?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is absolutely true. There are many illustrations of the truth of that statement. Cities have been compelled, in many cases, to go to the Federal Government because the State legislatures were so apportioned against them that they could not get justice from their State governments. Congress has been compelled to act for them, rather than turn them over to the untimely mercies of the legislatures of the States. This is notably the case with respect to

airports. It is also the case in housing. It is also the case in mass transit. I think it is probably the case, at least partially, in the field of recreation. It is the case in many other areas.

Senators will remember that President Eisenhower established a committee to go into Federal-State relationships. He expected that it would result in turning over a great many Federal functions to the States, which could then deal with the cities. After the committee had been at work on the problem a number of years, the members virtually decided they could not do it. I have talked with the directors of research and the chairman of the committee, Mr. Meyer Katzenbach, a distinguished resident of my State, and president of Hart Schaffner & Marx. He said that what the problem came down to is that the cities had no real place to go except to the Federal Government. It was the unrepresentative character of the State legislatures that forced cities to go to Washington and ask the Federal Government to bypass some of the State governments.

What the Senator from Wisconsin is saying is that if the cities could only be assured of a fair deal through representative State governments, they would not have to come running to the Federal

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18853

Government, but they could largely fulfill their functions in our national life through their State governments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not also true that the main criticism against the burgeoning powerful Federal Government comes from two sources? It comes, in the first place, from Republicans, and with great sincerity. The Governors of Pennsylvania, New York, and other States have said that their solution for a progressive nation is to solve more of the Nation's problems at the State level. Also, the opposition has come from southerners, who place their belief in States rights. They say the responsibility for economic progress should be left to the States.

If their plea for more progressive States is to be effective, is it not essential that the State legislatures be responsive to the popular will? If the enormous change in population, which is characteristic of every State in our Union, moving from rural areas into the cities and from the cities into the suburbs, is not reflected in the State legislatures, is not this sincere conviction of many outstanding leaders, that States should act going to be a hollow and empty plea, because we know if we do not provide for population reapportionment in this area we will not solve the Nation's problems as we should at the State level?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Those who believe in federalism as opposed to centralism should support reapportionment and support the decisions of the Supreme Court, because by making State governments more representative, they would permit State governments to deal more adequately with the problems of the urban people who live in the cities and suburbs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly in California we have the most striking example. State Senator Tom Rees represents a district with 4 million people—

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is 6 million people.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it 6 million people?

Another representative represents a county having—

Mr. DOUGLAS. He represents 14,000 people.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Fourteen thousand people. This is a disproportion which is grossly unfair. Obviously, the needs of Los Angeles, which has 40 percent of the population of California within the county, cannot be handled appropriately by one of the two bodies of the California Legislature.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. By putting in the statistics and background showing that in case after case there is gross misrepresentation and total lack of representation in the State legislature, the Senator is showing very pointedly and convincingly the basic reason for our States failing to meet the social and political problems of our times, and the necessity for our Federal Government doing more for the people. Poor apportionment prevents State action, and makes Federal action more likely.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

DID THE STARS FALL ON ALABAMA?

My colleague had harsh things to say about the Supreme Court in the Reynolds case, the reapportionment in Alabama. Let me read from the factual description of the matter given in the majority opinion on page 10 of the Supreme Court decision in the Reynolds case:

On July 21, 1962, the district court held that the inequality of the existing representation in the Alabama Legislature violated the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, a finding which the court noted had been "generally conceded" by the parties to the litigation, since population growth and shifts had converted the 1901 scheme, as perpetuated some 60 years later, into an invidiously discriminatory plan completely lacking in rationality.

They were operating in 1961 with the reapportionment laid down by the Alabama legislature 60 years before. Said the Chief Justice:

Under the existing provisions, applying 1960 census figures, only 25.1 percent of the State's total population resided in districts represented by a majority of the Members of the Senate, and only 25.7 percent lived in counties which could elect a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

In other words, one-quarter of the people elected slightly more than half of the representatives in the House and in the Senate. Three-quarters of the people elected less than half.

Population-variance ratios of up to about 41 to 1 existed in the Senate, and up to about 16 to 1 in the House. Bullock County, with a population of only 13,462, and Henry County, with a population of only 15,286, which were allocated two seats in the Alabama House, whereas Mobile County, with a population of 314,301, was given only 3 seats, and Jefferson County—

I presume that is where Birmingham is located— with 634,864 people, had only 7 representatives.

That is in the Alabama House. We see that the representation in the House of Mobile County was only about one-seventeenth or one-eighteenth of what it was for Henry and Bullock Counties.

With respect to senatorial apportionment, since the pertinent Alabama constitutional provisions had been consistently construed as prohibiting the giving of more than one senate seat to any one county, Jefferson County with over 600,000 people, was given only one Senator, as was Lowndes County, with a 1960 population of only 15,417, and Wilcox County, with only 18,739 people.

In other words, the representation of Lowndes County in the senate was approximately 40 times as great per person as it was in Jefferson County, and 32 or 33 times as great in Wilcox County as in Jefferson County.

No wonder the Supreme Court ruled as it did. It had to do so in the face of such unfairness.

I shall give some more horrible examples now, and reserve more detailed figures for tomorrow, when I shall speak in greater detail and at greater length.

WHAT ABOUT CONNECTICUT?

Let us take Connecticut. In Connecticut, in the lower house, the largest district represents 81,089 people, and the smallest represents 191 people. In Con-

necticut, each town or city in the State has two members in the house of representatives. There 118 of such towns and cities, and there are therefore, 236 members in the lower house. The 5 great cities of Connecticut, namely, New Haven, Hartford, Bridgeport, Danbury, and 1 other, have 10 representatives out of the 236, or 4 percent of the membership. They have approximately half or more than half of the total population. There is a hill town on Connecticut where by 1960 census figures 191 people are entitled to a representative. However, it takes 81,000 to have a representative in the largest districts.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Now let us take the State of New Hampshire. I wish the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] who graces this body so charmingly, were present, as I go through these figures. The average population in a district is 1,517. The largest population figure is 3,244. What do Senators suppose the smallest district is which sends a representative to the New Hampshire Legislature? It is a town with three inhabitants. The three inhabitants send one legislator to Concord.

This is like the rotten borough outside Salisbury Cathedral prior to the Reform Act. Outside Salisbury Cathedral there was a parliamentary district known as Old Sarum. Nobody lived there, but it sent two members to Parliament. At the time of the election the man who owned the feudal estate would come down and have a tent erected, and he would send his two representatives to Parliament from that rotten borough, while the cities of Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, and Sheffield, rising industrial cities, were completely unrepresented or had only a small fraction of representation.

It was the existence of this unequal representation which threatened England with revolution. It was not until the reform bill of 1830 was passed, under the threat of revolution, that steps were taken to remedy the situation.

I notice, since I started my remarks, my good friend the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has come in the Chamber. I should explain to him that I was holding Connecticut up as a horrible example in the matter of representation in the lower house in Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. The Senator is right. I believe it is probably the worst example in the Union.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may have one other that is just as bad. New Hampshire is just as bad.

Mr. DODD. I do not know the situation in New Hampshire, but in Connecticut we have towns of 500 or 600 inhabitants with two representatives in the assembly, and the city of Hartford, with over 160,000 inhabitants, has only two representatives.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The table seems to show one town that has six people.

Mr. DODD. In Connecticut?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In Connecticut. Six people send two representatives.

Mr. DODD. I believe the Senator's figures are out of date.

18854

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am quoting from Eisenberg's "Devaluation of the Urban and Suburban Vote," at page 2.

Mr. DODD. I do not know of any town that has six inhabitants.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It may be tucked in the Connecticut Berkshires somewhere.

Mr. DODD. Anything is possible under our terrible system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, the Senator is correct. The figure I cited refers to the ratio of the largest to smallest population per member of the Connecticut lower house. That is, the largest population per member exceeds the smallest by 670 percent or a ratio of 6.7.

VERMONT

Now let us take Vermont. I wish the senior Senator from Vermont were on the floor. Vermont, so far as its assembly is concerned, is operating on a 1793 apportionment. They laid out the districts in 1793, and have not revised them since then. In Vermont, one town with a population of 36 elects one member to the lower house. Another town with 35,535 elects one representative. Here, in this minute hamlet, one voter has the same influence as a thousand voters in the largest town in the State.

Mr. President, I have been both in New Hampshire and Vermont and have inspected the quarters of the State legislatures. The New Hampshire lower house is one of the largest legislative bodies in the world. As I remember, it is larger than the National House of Representatives. It is second only to the British House of Commons.

It is impossible to throw a stone in New Hampshire without hitting someone who has been in the legislature. It used to be said in the old days, when the Boston & Maine Railroad controlled the State, and the railroad gave passes to the legislators, that no one paid any fare on the railroad between Bretton Woods and Boston.

WHAT ABOUT MONTANA?

If we may believe David and Eisenberg, in the Montana upper house, in the smallest district, 894 people elect a senator; in the largest district, which I presume is Butte, 79,916. In other words, one voter from the smallest senatorial district in Montana has as much representation as 88 voters in the largest county.

I could continue for hours describing this situation.

A MINORITY GENERALLY ELECTS A MAJORITY

Let me take a cognate phase of the subject, namely, the percentage of the population which can control a majority of the lower houses in State legislatures and a majority of the members in State senates. Let us start with the lower house.

In Kansas, less than 20 percent can elect a majority of the lower house; in Delaware, 18.5 percent; in Rhode Island, 46.5 percent; in Connecticut, 12 percent. That is what enabled the Connecticut Light & Power Co.—Mr. J. Henry Rohr-

bach—to control the politics of Connecticut for many years.

In Florida—and I wish the senior Senator and the junior Senator from Florida were in the chamber—29 percent of the population elect a majority of the lower house. Until recently, approximately 13 percent could do this, but now 29 percent can elect a majority because much reform has been adopted under the shotgun of the Supreme Court decisions.

I have prepared a table and chart on this subject, which was originally developed by the New York Times and published in the issue of Sunday, June 21, 1964. I shall place it on the desks of Senators tomorrow; I do not wish to waste its potency on the desert air tonight.

I should point out that while in general the upper houses of State legislatures are more unrepresentative than the lower houses, this is not true in certain cases, notably in Kansas, Vermont, and Connecticut.

In Vermont, 12 percent of the population can elect a majority of the lower house. In Connecticut, 12 percent of the population can elect a majority. In Kansas, 19.4 percent can elect a majority of the lower house. In Delaware, 18.5 percent can elect a majority.

An interesting bit of colonial history is involved in the Vermont-New Hampshire situation. As I understand it, each State was desirous of obtaining the allegiance of the towns along the Connecticut River, New Hampshire hoping to induce towns west of the Connecticut River, and Vermont hoping to induce towns east of the Connecticut River. So guarantees of equal representation of the towns were offered. With the movement of population since the Revolutionary War, these ratios have become grossly disproportionate. In Vermont, they have not been revised since 1791 with respect to the lower house.

In terms of State Senates, there are some interesting facts. In Nevada, 8 percent of the population can elect a majority of the State Senate. The cities of Reno and Las Vegas, with their flourishing enterprises, do not send many representatives to the Nevada Senate, but the sagebrush counties and towns do.

In Idaho, 16.6 percent of the population can elect a majority. In Wyoming, 24 percent of the population can elect a majority. In Montana, 16.1 percent, or about one-sixth of the population, can elect a majority of the State Senate.

Now consider Arizona, from which we have heard much about the fact that we should allow the States to take over—although they wish a billion and a half dollars from the Federal Government for the central Arizona water project. In Arizona 12.8 percent of the population can control a majority of the Arizona Senate.

In New Mexico, only 14 percent—one-seventh of the population—can elect a majority of the State senate.

In California, which we have covered before, 10.7 percent, or less than one-

ninth of the population, can elect a majority of the State senate.

In Florida, 15 percent can elect a majority.

In Delaware, 22 percent.

In Maryland, 14.2 percent.

These are States with "rotten boroughs." That is all they can be described as—"rotten boroughs."

New Jersey—19 percent can elect a majority of the State senate.

Rhode Island—18 percent.

I have spoken of the Eastern Shore, which dominates the Maryland Legislature.

South Jersey, in similar fashion, dominates the New Jersey Legislature. South Jersey counties have vegetation, pine trees, sand, and ocean beaches, but they do not have much in the way of population. Still, they dominate the New Jersey Senate—under the State constitution's provision, I believe, of one senator per county; with the result, of course, that the great cities of New Jersey—Jersey City, Newark, and Camden—are relatively underrepresented. The sand barons and the pine barons of south Jersey are said to represent them.

Pine trees control. Sand controls the New Jersey Senate.

If one can control the senate one can veto legislation which goes through. One can exact a price for compliance and powerfully shape legislation and not merely exercise a veto.

Tomorrow, when I have time to speak at greater length on the subject, and have the opportunity to develop my argument more fully, I shall be able to bring out additional facts. But I should like to deal with one final point, and that is the question: To what degree have the State legislatures moved to reduce these great disparities in representation?

STATE LEGISLATURES HAVE REFUSED TO REFORM THEMSELVES

My friend and colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would issue a stay order and prevent the Supreme Court or the Federal court from ordering reapportionment. He would put these matters up once again to the State legislatures, which have had this question before them for year after year and decade after decade. What have they done?

Let me take up some of these items—and I shall be speaking of facts as of January 31, 1964.

The last time Connecticut reapportioned its house was in 1876. Eighty-eight years had rolled by and Connecticut still stood where it stood in 1876. Before that, the last time it had reapportioned was in 1818.

According to my figures, as of January 31 of this year, the last time Connecticut reapportioned its Senate was in 1903.

The last time Delaware apportioned, according to the statistics published in "The Book of the States—1964-65," was in 1897.

The last time Rhode Island apportioned its House was in 1930. I can remember the time when one branch of the

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18855

Rhode Island legislature took automobiles and went out of the State so that they could not be compelled to reapportion. They took refuge in the Whale Inn, west of Northampton, in a place called, I believe, Chesterfield. They hid out there through late summer and fall, in order to prevent reapportionment in Rhode Island. I am sure that both Senators from Rhode Island know these facts.

Six States in the Union are clearly in violation of their own constitutions. Among such States, Connecticut, Delaware, Louisiana, and Rhode Island, are conspicuous.

Moreover, to the degree that there has been compliance in the years 1962, 1963, and 1964, it has been accomplished under the shotgun of State and Federal court orders. If it had not been for the court orders now complained about, the State legislatures would not have reapportioned.

Such progress as we have made, an article published in the Washington Post described it as "inching," has been under either a direct order of a Federal court or under a fiat, that if they did not act there would be Federal reapportionment. In many cases, the legislatures came in with a grossly unsatisfactory act in the hope that they could deal with the Federal courts, and with an unjust order—but not quite so unjust as the apportionment was originally. These include Georgia and Tennessee—possibly they may include New York.

Governor Rockefeller, anticipating that the verdict at the polls may be adverse to his party, is desirous of calling a meeting of the present legislature before the new legislature is elected. This would be done so that it can apportion the seats in New York so as to preserve a Republican majority, as has been done in the past, when the Democrats have heavily carried the State, yet have not been able to gain control of both branches of the State legislature.

Let me take up the question of the slowness of the States to reapportion, despite, in most cases, clear mandates in their State constitutions to do so every 10 years.

Alabama did not reapportion between 1906 and 1962. The constitution required it in Alabama, but they did not do it.

Connecticut did not reapportion, as I have stated, between 1818 and 1876 for its house; and up to the 1st of January of this year had not reapportioned again.

Illinois did not reapportion between 1901 and 1955. The legislature put itself beyond the control of the courts. It found that nothing could be done to enforce the State constitution.

Indiana did not reapportion between 1921 and 1963.

Kentucky did not reapportion between 1942 and 1963.

Louisiana did not reapportion between 1921 and 1963. It still has not reapportioned its senate.

Minnesota did not reapportion between 1913 and 1959.

Mississippi did not reapportion between 1916 and 1963.

Nebraska did not reapportion between 1935 and 1963.

New Hampshire did not reapportion its senate between 1915 and 1961.

New Jersey did not reapportion between 1941 and 1961.

North Carolina did not reapportion between 1941 and 1961 for its house, and between 1941 and 1963 for its senate.

North Dakota did not reapportion between 1931 and 1963 for its house, and still has not reapportioned its senate.

Pennsylvania has not reapportioned its senate between 1921 and 1964.

The State of Washington did not reapportion between 1931 and 1957—and prior to 1931, I believe, it did not reapportion either senate or house since 1901 or 1891.

It was my good fortune, many years ago, to know the late J. Allen Smith, professor of political science at the University of Washington, who in many ways was one of the most farsighted and prescient political scientists of the last three or four generations. He was, to my mind, as great a political scientist as Charles A. Beard, of Columbia University.

J. Allen Smith once told me—this was over 40 years ago—that he thought the greatest weakness of the State governments was the failure of the State legislatures to reapportion. He pointed to his own State of Washington as a horrible example. I believe he said there had been no reapportionment since 1901—but it was probably since 1891. He pointed out that some of the desert counties in eastern Washington had as much representation as the cities. I am sorry to hurt the feelings of my good friend from Washington, but I know he is not a part of it.

Wisconsin did not reapportion between 1920 and 1951, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] knows. I know that when he was a member of the Wisconsin Senate he tried very hard to get adequate reapportionment.

Wyoming did not reapportion between 1951 and 1962.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would like to tell the Senator from Illinois that the State of Wisconsin has recently reapportioned both houses of the legislature. Both houses of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin are perfectly, almost precisely, almost mathematically precisely representative.

This was a tremendous achievement by my distinguished colleague [Mr. NELSON] when he was Governor, and by the present Governor, John Reynolds. Both did a terrific job.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Both happen to be Democrats.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Both happen to be Democrats. And the point is that I have

consulted with the leading legal experts on this subject. They tell me that if the Dirksen amendment is passed, the Wisconsin apportionment may go out the window. That means that the people who have filed for election to the Wisconsin Legislature, under the apportionment that was perfect, which was made, as I say, about 2 months ago—may have to refile in new districts. Candidates running for the 100 seats in the assembly, and the 16 or 17 seats in the senate that are open will have to file on an entirely different basis. Just one person, one member of the former legislature—of course there will be several who are reapportioned out of a job under section 3—will be in a position to file after the order. The entire Wisconsin perfect apportionment may be in jeopardy. It seems to me that this is a matter which is not only one of fundamental principles, but also one of the greatest practical interest to my State. I have a duty to do all that I can to defeat this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is good enough. I know the persistence of the Senator from Wisconsin. Well do I remember that night some years back when we were trying to get an additional 1,000 cubic feet of Lake Michigan water for the Chicago sanitary system. The Senator from Wisconsin with assembled pages before him announced that he was ready to talk all night. The news that the Senator from Wisconsin will do everything possible to defeat this amendment fills me with the same enthusiasm that the army of the Commonwealth, in the days when they were fighting against Charles II, had when they saw Oliver Cromwell riding over the moors. The prospect of the energetic Senator from Wisconsin coming to our assistance raises my heart just as the sight of Oliver Cromwell raised the hearts of the Roundheads fighting against the Cavaliers.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois if it is not true that in view of the complexity of this subject and the fact that so many States are involved, we should go into each State and examine the problem? Is it not true that to have a proper, adequate, comprehensive, educational job performed, this amendment will require many days of discussion?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. This amendment has been sprung without hearings in the Judiciary Committee. It was developed under secret negotiations. Its final form was brought out only today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And in its final form it has not been considered by any committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And it is entirely different, according to the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Now, Mr. President, as an example of the absurdity, as I have mentioned, Vermont has not apportioned its house

18856

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

since 1793. The State legislatures have, in the main, refused to act. When they have acted, they have acted only under the orders of the courts, and the Federal courts in most cases.

The junior Senator from Illinois, my colleague, would stop this entire process of having the Federal court orders operate. He would turn over to the State legislatures, most of which are already grossly unrepresentative, the decision as to whether or not they should reform themselves.

As Patrick Henry said, "I know of only one way to judge the future, and that is by the past." And the record of the past indicates that State legislatures have not acted and will not act unless under court pressure.

This amendment purposes to put a gag on the court, to put gags in the mouths of the Federal courts of this country, and depend upon those who are the beneficiaries of an unfair and unjust system to reform themselves. There is little or no evidence of self-reform on the part of the State legislatures. The proponents want to put a stay in effect, and then rush through their constitutional amendment. And with the prejudice against the big cities which exists, they may get it through the Congress. But they will have to fight for it. They might get it through. Once it gets through the Congress, the present State legislatures are pretty safe if they can only hold off reform for a time.

Now, Mr. President, I shall briefly discuss another crucial issue in this controversy.

NO PROPER ANALOGY BETWEEN U.S. SENATE AND STATE SENATES

In the Senate of the United States, two Senators represent each State. That was a compromise which the large States were forced to make in 1787 in order to have any Union whatsoever. The small States, of course, control the Senate. I worked these figures out in recent years and I think I can correctly recall them. States with only 25 percent of the population control the majority of the Senators in this body. The eight Mountain States with a total population of only approximately 6 million people have 16 votes. And the eight largest States in the Union—some of which are New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, and New Jersey—have 16 votes. But they have over 80 million people.

This is the result of the compromise of 1787. This was the price which the big States paid for the Union. The small States at that time stated that they would not join the Union unless they had equality of representation in at least one House of the National Legislature. And the Delegate from Delaware, Gunning Bedford, as I remember—according to Madison's journal, threatened at one point in the proceedings that if Delaware were not given equal representation, Delaware would not join the Union, but would make an alliance with a foreign power. We would have had either France or Great Britain planted on our shore. And with the pistol pointed at

their heads, the delegations from Massachusetts and Virginia permitted equality of representation in order to get union. This is the one feature in the Federal system which cannot be altered. Article V of the Constitution states that no State shall be deprived of equal representation in the Senate without its consent, the precise language being:

No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

That is the one feature in the Constitution which cannot be amended, and which is beyond the control of amendments.

Mr. President, we in the big cities, while we regret this, are not threatening to secede from the Union, as Delaware threatened in 1787. We know that the provision places us at a disadvantage in this body. We know that in a sense we are second-class citizens in this body. But that was the price of union.

I, as senior Senator from Illinois, voted for the admission of Alaska and Hawaii, which, in effect, diluted the already diluted strength of my State. I did so because I thought it was good for the United States of America. Unlike certain Members of the Senate, I placed the interests of the United States ahead even of the interests of my State. I make that statement without any reflection upon individuals. I try to act for the interests of the United States, because we are a nation and not a confederation. We were a confederation under the Articles of Confederation, but we became a federated power with the adoption of the Constitution.

The advantages are great. As a nation, we have contributed greatly to the world; and we of the big States are ready to accept the permanent shackles which are fastened upon us and the frequent humiliations which are heaped upon us as individuals. We will suffer all of those disadvantages in the interest of the United States.

But there is no reason why that arrangement should be carried out inside the States. There is no reason, as I shall develop at greater length tomorrow when I have an opportunity fully to make my arguments, why land should be equally represented in the States. There is no reason why each county should have equal representation in the Senate of Maryland or in the Senate of California or in the Senate of New Jersey or in the Senate or Nevada or the Senate of Montana or the other States, because while States were sovereign at the formation of the Union, counties and towns are not sovereign within the States. They are creatures of the State. The State is not their creature. If in the early days of New Hampshire, Vermont, and Connecticut it was necessary to federate the towns in order to get them in, that necessity has long since passed, and in law and in practice, in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Connecticut, as well as in the rest of the Union, the town, which is the predominant system of government in New England, is a legal creature of the State. Their consent is not

needed as the consent of Delaware, Maryland, and New Jersey was needed at the formation of the Republic.

Therefore, the argument by analogy that because there is an equality of representation of States in the U.S. Senate there should be equality in the representation in the bodies of State legislatures, generally the senate, but in certain cases the house, falls completely to the ground. I shall deal with that subject tomorrow at greater length and in more detail.

In my judgment the Supreme Court has been completely correct. It has moved to try to correct an old injustice which has operated against the people of both the cities and of the suburbs, because the suburbs are now as important as the cities. The Supreme Court has moved to remove injustices which the legislatures themselves would not remove because they failed to act over long periods of time. Instead of condemning the Supreme Court, we should praise it. Instead of holding up John Marshall Harlan II, we should hold up Earl Warren and the majority of the Court. They were correct in the civil rights cases; they are correct in the apportionment cases. It is a tragedy that a campaign against the Supreme Court has operated to inflame a certain section of the public mind against it.

In my judgment, the Supreme Court has never risen to greater heights than in the last 10 years, and the decisions on reapportionment match the great decisions on denial of civil rights through segregated education handed down in 1954 and 1955. So, far from impeaching Earl Warren, I think he is one of the greatest citizens this Nation has ever had, and I take my stand along with him.

WHAT ARE THE EMOTIONS BEHIND THIS MAN

Mr. President, I know that in matters of this kind it is not pure reason which governs, but rather emotion and, in a sense, prejudice. I know what the prejudices and emotions are which run below the surface. A part of the feeling is resentment against the Supreme Court for its civil rights decisions; part of it is fear on the part of entrenched, petty, peanut politicians that they would not be reelected to the State legislatures if the districts were properly apportioned.

There are even stronger motives than that. There is a fear on the part of some of those across the aisle or in the Republican Party that implementation of the Court's decision would strengthen Democratic control over the State legislatures.

Mr. President, if it is right and just, it should not be condemned because it would help the Democrats. Justice is independent of party; and I do not believe that we Democrats should lacerate ourselves and acknowledge our inferiority because the decision might help the Democratic Party. I believe our friends across the aisle have no right to favor their measure because they think it would help their party.

Justice does not reside entirely in the Republican Party. It does not reside entirely in the Democratic Party. But merely because a proposal might help the Democratic Party is no reason why this body should reject it. I hope that Democrats may cure themselves of any inferiority complex which the Republicans may strive to instill in them, and stand for this measure if they think it is right.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the most rapidly growing sections of our States and the most unrepresented are the suburbs?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that, by and large, the central cities are losing population?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have already developed that point at great length. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that it is quite possible, if not likely, that in areas which are usually Republican—as it would work in my State in relation to apportionment, which I discussed a few minutes ago with the Senator—the Republicans would gain at least as much as would the Democrats by the proposed apportionment? As the Senator has said, the question should be decided on the basis of justice, and not on the basis of partisan advantage.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What the Senator has said is completely correct. I pointed out that the suburbs now in many cases are more populous than the central cities. We all know that the suburbs tend to be strongly Republican, more strongly Republican, indeed, than the central cities tend to be Democratic.

In my State of Illinois a very able political reporter, Mr. Tom Littlewood, who is the political correspondent at Springfield for the Chicago Sun Times, has prepared an analysis of what would be the likely results of the reapportionment of the Illinois State Senate. In Illinois, 29 percent of the population elect a majority of the Illinois State Senate, and 71 percent of the population elect a minority. The 29 percent of the population have two and a half times the voting power in the State senate than the 71 percent of the population have. Mr. Littlewood said that "down State," which is known as the area outside the Chicago metropolitan area, would lose eight Senate seats. It is believed that at least two of those would be Democrats, possibly three. How would those eight seats be reapportioned? First Chicago would gain two seats, and the suburbs in Cook County outside of Chicago would gain three seats. These three new suburban seats would undoubtedly, under present conditions, be Republican. We hope to change that, but as of now, they are Republican.

Second, three more seats would be gained in the following counties: Du Page, which is the strongest Repub-

lican county, stronger than Westchester County; Kane, which is an industrial county, but with some rural residences; and Lake, which, with a population along the lake front, is heavily residential, as is McHenry County. They are all strong Republican counties. They would gain three seats.

So the Democratic gains in Chicago would just about offset the Democratic losses downstate. The six Republican gains in the Chicago area would roughly balance the six or five Republican losses downstate.

There would be no real party change in this respect, but there would be a real change with regard to the representation of the cities and suburbs. So Chicago would be more adequately represented in accordance with its population and so would the suburbs to an even greater extent.

What is true of Chicago is true of most cities. I think in the South the Democratic Party would definitely be hurt, because the situation in the South is different from that in the North and West. It is the country districts there which are Democratic, and it is the cities which are becoming Republican. There is no more conservative city in the country than Houston or Dallas. They are grossly underrepresented in the State legislatures, and indeed in the Congress. This is true throughout the South. There would be a decrease in Democratic strength and an increase in Republican strength.

I am for that, even though it would hurt the Democratic Party, because it is just and because I think right and justice should stand above party. But I would also before it if it helped the Democratic Party. I appeal to my friends to put the country first, and insofar as the South is concerned, they will benefit by it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask a question or two of the Senator from Illinois. The first is with respect to the pending amendment—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean the so-called Dirksen amendment?

Mr. MILLER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], No. 1215.

As I understand the amendment in its application to my own State of Iowa, a three-man court in Iowa directed the Iowa Legislature to reapportion itself on an interim basis. It directed further that it should also reapportion itself on a permanent basis in line with the Iowa constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean that the Iowa constitution had previously been violated?

Mr. MILLER. Parts of the Iowa constitution were held to be unconstitutional under the 14th amendment of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was it not violated by the refusal of the Iowa Legislature to reapportion?

Mr. MILLER. That is not quite correct. I point out, however—I think this is responsive to what the Senator is interested in—that parts of the Iowa constitution were held to be unconstitutional under the Federal Constitution, more particularly under the 14th amendment. As a result of the three-man court order, the Iowa Legislature inaugurated an interim apportionment plan. It was duly adopted. Primary elections were held last June to fill seats in the newly apportioned legislature. Both houses were apportioned in line with the court order, one house being strictly on a population basis, and the other house being on a substantially population basis but with some area factor involved, so that, as a result, about 40 percent of the population would be in control of the second house, rather than 51 percent.

The Iowa Legislature also passed a so-called permanent reapportionment plan which would require adoption in identical form in the next successive session of the legislature, and then a vote of the people.

I find it impossible to believe, as a result of the Supreme Court decision in Reynolds against Sims holding that both Houses must be on a population basis, that this three-man court would, in implementing the Supreme Court's decision, now order the Iowa Legislature to be reconvened, to adopt the reapportionment plans in accordance with the Reynolds against Sims opinion, and then to have a special primary election some time in September, to be followed by the general election in November.

In my best judgment, and according to my best advice, the effect of the three-man court order would—

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the question of the Senator?

Mr. MILLER. I am leading up to the question. I think it important, in order to develop the question, that the foundation be laid, as I am doing it.

I find it impossible to believe that the three-man court would do this. I think it will let things remain as they are. They will let the election go forward in November and the interim legislature meeting next year, in line with the three-man court direction of last spring—

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the question?

Mr. MILLER. The most that could be done then would be for the regular session of the legislature next year to adopt a reapportionment plan in line with Reynolds against Sims.

The election thereunder would not be held until 1966, and the newly reapportioned legislature would not meet until January 1967.

As I read the amendment, it would have absolutely no impact on that situation. The newly apportioned legislature would come into being quite naturally, regardless of the fact that the amendment was adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope my good friend will not object if I again ask him what his question is.

18858

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

Mr. MILLER. I will ask the Senator the question if he will be a little more patient.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have been patient for many minutes. I hope the Senator will forgive if I repeat. I should like to hear the question.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Illinois and I have had many colloquies before. I have always been more than willing to let him lay his foundation for a question. However, the question is this: Why, in the face of this situation, would the Senator from Illinois object to the adoption of the pending amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that the question?

Mr. MILLER. That is the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My reply is that Iowa certainly needed to reapportion, and that it would not have done so without the prior decisions of the Supreme Court. Reading from this study by David and Eisenberg, as of the 1960 census, in the lower house, there were 108 members. The smallest population per member was 7,468. The largest population per member was 133,157. The smallest district had approximately 19 times as much representation per person as the largest district. I presume that would be Des Moines.

So far as the upper house is concerned, which has a membership of 50, the smallest district had 17,756, and the largest 266,315 per member. So the ratio there was about 16 to 1.

Mr. MILLER. I served in that legislature. I already know those figures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The country may not know the figures. So far as the lower House is concerned, the lowest district had 17.8 times the representation per person. So far as the Senate is concerned, it was 15 times.

The Senator from Illinois is not an expert on the subject, but we might find that the same situation that the Senator from Wisconsin anticipated will hold good for Iowa, namely, that if the amendment goes into effect, the previous reapportionment will fall to the ground and the State will have to go back to the previous legislature, which was badly apportioned. That may be true. I ask my friend from Iowa to stop, look, and listen before he follows my junior colleague down the primrose path, which may have a bear trap at the end.

Mr. MILLER. Almost anything could happen. We might have a tornado in Iowa which would destroy the general assembly. What I am interested in is how the amendment would affect the situation in Iowa.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Every man seems to be his own constitutional lawyer. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] pointed out that it might well be that the reapportionment in the Wisconsin Legislature, which I believe is more thoroughgoing than it is in Iowa, may be thrown out by the court because of the provisions of the present amendment, if it is enacted. I merely say that this is something to consider. I advise

my friend from Iowa to watch, look, and listen before he goes overboard in support of the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. As I read the amendment, all it provides is that the Governor of Iowa or the Attorney General of Ohio or any member of the Legislature of Iowa may go before the three-man court in Des Moines and request a stay with respect to the implementation of the Reynolds versus Sims decision.

I suggest to my friend from Illinois that it is not necessary to do that at all. I know every member of the three-man court. I am sure they will not immediately order the Iowa Legislature to convene and adopt a new reapportionment plan, then set up special laws for the primary election in September, and then go through with the November election, so that in January they will come in under the newly reapportionment program. I am sure they will go through with their original decision to have the interim legislature, for which members have already been nominated, and to which they will be elected in November, convene, and that then they will expect the new legislature to reapportion along the lines of the Reynolds versus Sims case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope my friend is correct in his reading of the crystal ball. However, there is no surety about it. My friend from Wisconsin may wish to comment.

Mr. PROXMIER. If we adopt the amendment, we take discretion away from the court. We would provide that a stay for the period necessary shall be deemed to be in the public interest in the absence of highly unusual circumstances. The author of the amendment, Senator DIRKSEN, has said that this means that in 99.66 percent of the cases, it would be mandatory. The court would be stopped cold from putting its orders into effect.

The courts were proceeding to bring voting equality throughout America. They will not be able to proceed if this amendment is adopted. The three-man Iowa court must stop the execution of its apportionment decision. It would revert back to the previous situation before apportionment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the decisions of the court will not further affect Iowa, the Senator from Iowa does not have to vote for the Dirksen amendment. Things will take their course. Why take a chance on muddying the waters?

Mr. MILLER. The answer to that, of course, is the same answer the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Wisconsin gave in a situation like that, namely, we are not that provincial; we are legislating for all the 50 States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator started on Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I cited Iowa because I was most familiar with it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, on a matter with which the Senator is most familiar, there is no doubt.

Mr. MILLER. The only danger that I can see is what the Senator from Illinois would suggest, namely, that if the amendment were not adopted, the three-man court in Des Moines would convene the Iowa Legislature and tell it to reapportion in a matter of 10 or 11 days; then have a special primary election held in September, and go through with the regular election in November. If the Senator is suggesting that as a possibility, I certainly would be in favor of the Dirksen amendment, because it would be chaotic to have such a procedure. It would be so chaotic that I am sure the three-man court in Des Moines would not do it. However, if the Senator from Illinois is suggesting this as a possibility, I have every reason to support the pending amendment, which has been offered by the two leaders in the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My good friend has spoken about taking the National point of view and not the State point of view. If that is the case, I advise him to look to the State of Wisconsin, where, the Senator from Wisconsin has said, things might be thrown into chaos. It is admitted that things would not be thrown into chaos in Iowa by the decisions of the Court as they now stand. My good friend says he is not particularly concerned about Iowa, but concerned about other States. I am concerned about Iowa. I do not want his fair State, the greatest corn-producing State in the Union, thrown into chaos. I do not want to have the great State of Wisconsin thrown into chaos. We should proceed in an orderly manner to reapportion in accordance with court orders.

Mr. MILLER. If the Senator wishes to proceed in an orderly manner to reapportion, he should have more faith in the reasonableness of the Federal courts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I prefer the courts to the State legislatures but we have been speaking about State legislatures.

Mr. MILLER. He should have more faith in the courts applying standards set forth in the amendment. They are to see to it that a stay is granted, but only for a reasonable time. I point out to the Senator from Illinois that a reasonable time in the mind of the three-man court in Des Moines is a matter of months, not a matter of years.

Furthermore, I suggest that if there should be a court in some other State which saw fit to delay the matter unduly, there would be opportunities to carry the issue before the Supreme Court; and my guess is that the Supreme Court is not interested in moving slowly in this matter; nor is this amendment designed for slow movement. I think that the part relating to January 1, 1966, shows an evidence that it is intended—I believe the junior Senator from Illinois will point this out, if he has not already done so—that legislatures that convene in regular

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18859

session after January 1, 1966, will be reapportioned according to the Constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It does not say that; it says that the legislatures of such States shall have "a reasonable opportunity in regular session * * * following the adjudication of constitutionality to apportion representation in such legislature in accordance with the Constitution."

Mr. MILLER. If the Senator will read the paragraph previous to the one he just read, he will see the date "January 1, 1966."

Mr. DOUGLAS. That merely relates to the State election of representatives before 1966; it does not concern future reapportionment.

Mr. MILLER. The January 1966 target date, referred to in the previous paragraph, lends credence to the understanding that has been expressed, and will be expressed, that legislatures be properly apportioned when they convene in regular session following January 1, 1966. If the Senator from Illinois has any question about that intention, he might wish to develop it, because I think it is important and is reasonable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I intend to develop my questioning tomorrow, when I shall have an opportunity to expand at greater length upon this subject.

Mr. MILLER. May I go on to another point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield for questions; otherwise, after a brief statement, I shall yield the floor, and the Senator from Iowa may make a speech.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa does not wish to make a speech; he wishes to enjoy a colloquy with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to answer questions; but one of the rules of this body is that a Senator may not yield for a speech without taking a chance on losing his right to the floor. I do not wish to have someone take me off my feet because I might forget to say that I will yield on condition that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. MILLER. I assure the Senator from Illinois that he need have no fears on that point.

The Senator from Illinois is familiar with the fact, is he not, that several constitutional amendments on this subject are pending in both the House and Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is just the point.

Mr. MILLER. One of them provides that in States having bicameral legislatures, one house must be elected strictly on a population basis; but that the people shall have the exclusive right to determine the composition of the other house.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Whose constitutional amendment proposal is that?

Mr. MILLER. Several such proposals have been introduced in the House. One has been introduced in the Senate by several members of both parties, including the junior Senator from Iowa. Is the Senator from Illinois familiar with the essence of the amendment to which I am referring?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not had an opportunity to study it in detail.

Mr. MILLER. The essence is, as I have stated, that one house must be elected strictly on a population basis, while the people of the State will decide for themselves the composition of the second house.

I ask the Senator from Illinois if he has any objection to leaving it to the people of the State, whether they come from Chicago, from the suburbs, or from the rural areas, deciding, in a proper referendum—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not by the legislature, but by the people?

Mr. MILLER. That is correct; the people in a general election or referendum would decide the question for themselves.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I have not studied the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. I am not at all certain that it will be the one actually proposed. But I shall make a basic point on this subject.

When Thomas Jefferson wrote the Preamble to the Declaration of Independence, he spoke of the basic rights of man:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

That means that one generation cannot give away its rights and bind a future generation. If one set of people cannot give away their rights, an individual cannot give away his rights.

It is an accepted principle of law that a man cannot contract himself into slavery or into serfdom. Suppose he signs a contract to give up his liberty. The courts have held that this is unconstitutional, because they knew that the contract might have been exacted from the person under conditions of which he was relatively ignorant, because he had unequal bargaining power, or because he was deluded.

The Senator from Iowa misunderstands the fundamental, basic rights of man. Jefferson said they are unalienable. There are certain rights that the community cannot take away from him, and which he himself cannot assign.

WHAT ABOUT THE 14TH AMENDMENT

I myself believe that the 14th amendment deserves more recognition than it gets in this body. Let me read the words of the 14th amendment:

SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

They are to have national citizenship as well as State citizenship. All are first-class citizens; none are second-class citizens. The 14th amendment continues:

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

Now we come to the essential point:

Nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.

The Supreme Court has held—and I believe correctly—that there cannot be equal protection of the laws if there is appreciably unequal representation; that approximately equal representation is needed to guarantee the equal protection of the laws; and that this is an unalienable right that man cannot sign away or vote away. Neither can a State legislature take it away.

An attempt is being made to fasten these shackles on the people of the various States, if malrepresented State legislatures choose to pass the amendment which is sent up to them and which, even under popular referendum, under pressure of the party press, might be approved. Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach says that the attempt is constitutional. I doubt it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. If the people do not like or do not agree with the decision of the Supreme Court, they certainly have the right, do they not, to adopt an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to change the decision of the Supreme Court?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is not the thrust of the proposed amendment. The Senator from Iowa may have this in mind; but the amendments I have seen and studied in detail provide that the matter is to go to the State legislatures, or may go to the State legislatures.

I point out that the State legislatures, in spite of the recent shotgun reforms they have carried out, are grossly malrepresented; and the amendment would turn over to unrepresentative bodies the power to continue themselves in office for a long period of time, and perhaps in perpetuity, by a constitutional amendment to that effect. That is the gist of what I am trying to say.

Mr. MILLER. That is the reason why I asked the question. I wanted to find out whether the Senator had misunderstood the proposal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may not understand the Miller amendment as thoroughly as the Senator does, but I promise him that I will study the amendment. Nevertheless, I think I know what some of the amendments originally put before the Committee on the Judiciary mean. They mean something totally different from what the Senator from Iowa says they mean.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa has studied the amendment, so he would understand it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator produce it, so that I may read it?

Mr. MILLER. I shall be happy to obtain a copy for the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I read it now?

Mr. MILLER. While the pages are obtaining a copy of the amendment, I should like to point out that the Senator from Illinois said that if this particular amendment were adopted, it would then be submitted, for ratification, to the State legislatures which are malapportioned, and that they could adopt the amendment and perpetuate themselves in office.

I point out again to the Senator from Illinois that the amendment of which I am speaking states specifically what has been stated earlier, that it would merely provide that the people of the State, and not the State legislature, would decide for themselves whether the second house should be on some other basis than a strictly popular basis.

I cannot understand the logic of the Senator—although he is one who always reasons with a great deal of logic—in concluding that such a provision would lead to the perpetuation of malapportionment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Iowa has stated his amendment accurately—and I do not have it yet, so it is not so available to Senators as it might be and so I may be pardoned if I do not have the details of it yet. But if the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is as he has stated it to be—which I am ready to believe it is—then it is a vast improvement on the amendments which came out of or are before the Judiciary Committee. However, it still does not deal with the basic question as to whether the equal protection of the laws is a fundamental right under the Constitution which cannot be waived even by a person himself or even by a majority.

Mr. MILLER. While I sometimes disagree with the Senator from Illinois and I sometimes agree with him, it has been my observation that he professes to have great faith in the people. It was therefore my hope that his support could be enlisted for my amendment because it does place in the people of a State—the very people the Senator is talking about in the case of his own State, the people in the big cities, the people in the suburbs, and the people in the rural areas—the power to decide the composition of the second house. I would hope that on review of my amendment, his support could be obtained. I believe that regardless of what the Supreme Court decisions may be, ultimately the power resides in the people of this country. If the people do not agree with the Supreme Court's decisions—and they may not—they have not on previous occasions—they have the power to change them.

I hold in my hand a copy of the proposed constitutional amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 185. There are many cosponsors of the amendment, as I pointed out earlier, from both sides of the aisle.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 185

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to reserve to each State exclusive power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the

legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. Except as otherwise provided by this article the citizens of each State shall have exclusive power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof, and such power shall not be infringed nor the exercise thereof be reviewed in an original action or on appeal or controlled by the United States or any branch of the Government thereof. The membership of at least one house of the legislature of each State shall be apportioned as nearly equally as possible according to the number of persons determined by the enumeration provided in article I, section 2, or if there is only one house of the legislature then upon such combination of population and area as the citizens of the State shall determine.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Illinois to section 1 on page 2.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is this the original Dirksen amendment?

Mr. MILLER. This has nothing to do with any amendment. This is a Senate joint resolution. Let me point out that similar measures have been introduced in the House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is Senate Joint Resolution 185.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The first sponsor of this amendment is my colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct. There are many others, including Senators from both sides of the aisle. As I said earlier, they include myself.

If the Senator will look on page 2, he will note that:

* * * citizens of each State shall have exclusive power to determine the composition of its legislature * * *

And then in the next sentence on line 3,

The membership of at least one house of the legislature of each State shall be apportioned as nearly equal as possible according to the number of persons determined by the enumeration * * *

Which is the census.

It is this language to which I have referred. I believe I have stated the essence of it quite accurately. As I said earlier in my observation of the frequent references of the Senator from Illinois to the people, I was persuaded that perhaps he might support the amendment, because it gives power to the people of a State to determine the composition of the second house. It would be a gross misstatement and a gross misunderstanding of the situation to suggest—as I am afraid the Senator from Illinois did earlier—that the adoption of the amendment and its ratification by a malapportioned legislature would lead to the perpetuation of themselves in office.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I cannot, at this time, go into an amendment which I have had

no opportunity to study. I shall consider the amendment later. I merely ask whether this is the original constitutional amendment which the Senator from Illinois prepared?

Mr. MILLER. I cannot respond to that. I know only what is before me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It does not seem to me to be the original amendment which I read. I shall be very glad to study it and consider the whole matter.

Mr. MILLER. The ultimate question resolves itself into whether the Senator from Illinois would be willing to leave it to the people to decide the composition of the second house.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to consider the whole amendment, because there are frequently beartraps in amendments which one should be careful about. I shall give the amendment careful consideration.

Mr. MILLER. I can understand why the Senator from Illinois would wish to study very carefully something as important as my amendment, but the point I wish to make—and I thank him for yielding to me so that I can do so—is that I believe it is very important to understand what we are talking about, because if there are any misunderstandings, I am afraid that the public may get some wrong impressions which will not be helpful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall look into this question and try to secure a copy of the original constitutional amendment as it came from the Committee on the Judiciary so that it may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, before the Senator asks unanimous consent for that insertion in the RECORD, let me suggest that he may be laboring under a misapprehension. To my knowledge, there has been no proper constitutional amendment reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee. I regret that it has not been reported, but I do not believe that it has. This amendment is still in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor under one condition—namely, that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the argument of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I be permitted to take the floor to reply, and that this will not be counted as a second speech.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have no objection. I am sure that the Senator need have no worry about any second speech in this or any other debate, because I believe that that procedure is fallacious and useless.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the explanatory address of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I be recognized and be permitted to respond, without the speech being counted as a second speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I also thank the majority leader.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18861

EXHIBIT 1

TABLE 1.—1960 and 1950 population of standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963

[Asterisk (*) identifies additions to standard metropolitan statistical areas as defined for 1960 census. Minus sign (—) denotes decrease]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase	Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase
United States (216 areas).....	115,796,265	91,568,113	26.5	Boston, Mass.—Continued			
Abilene, Tex.....	120,377	85,517	40.8	Middlesex County—Continued			
Abilene County.....	19,299	22,147	-12.9	Belmont Township.....	28,715	27,381	4.9
Taylor County.....	101,078	63,370	59.5	Burlington Township.....	12,852	3,250	295.4
Akron, Ohio.....	605,367	473,986	27.7	Concord Township.....	12,517	8,623	45.2
Portage County*.....	91,798	63,954	43.5	Framingham Township.....	44,526	28,086	58.5
Summit County.....	513,569	410,032	25.3	Lexington Township.....	27,691	17,335	59.7
Albany, Ga.....	75,680	43,617	73.5	Lincoln Township.....	5,613	2,427	131.3
Dougherty County.....	75,680	43,617	73.5	Natick Township.....	28,831	19,838	45.3
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y.	657,503	589,359	11.6	North Reading Township.....	8,331	4,402	89.3
Albany County.....	272,926	239,386	14.0	Reading Township.....	19,259	14,006	37.5
Rensselaer County.....	142,585	132,607	7.5	Sherborn Township*.....	1,806	1,245	45.1
Saratoga County.....	89,096	74,689	19.0	Stoneham Township.....	17,821	13,229	34.7
Schenectady County.....	152,896	142,497	7.3	Sudbury Township.....	7,447	2,596	186.9
Albuquerque, N. Mex.....	262,199	145,673	80.0	Wakefield Township.....	24,295	19,633	23.7
Bernalillo County.....	262,199	145,673	80.0	Watertown Township.....	39,092	37,329	4.7
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa.-N.J.	492,168	437,824	12.4	Wayland Township.....	10,444	4,407	137.0
Lehigh County, Pa.....	227,536	198,207	14.8	Weston Township.....	8,261	5,026	64.4
Northampton County, Pa.....	201,412	185,243	8.7	Wilmington Township.....	12,475	7,039	77.2
Warren County, N.J.....	63,220	54,374	16.3	Winchester Township.....	19,376	15,509	24.9
Altonna, Pa.....	137,270	139,514	-1.6	Norfolk County (part).....	446,524	348,156	28.3
Blair County.....	137,270	139,514	-1.6	Quincy City.....	87,409	83,835	4.3
Amarillo, Tex.....	149,493	87,140	71.6	Braintree Township.....	31,069	23,161	34.1
Potter County.....	115,580	73,366	57.5	Brookline Township.....	54,044	57,589	-6.2
Randall County.....	33,913	13,774	146.2	Canton Township.....	12,771	7,465	71.1
Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove, Calif.	703,925	216,224	225.6	Cohasset Township.....	5,840	3,731	56.5
Orange County.....	703,925	216,224	225.6	Dorchester Township.....	23,869	18,487	29.1
Ann Arbor, Mich.....	172,440	134,606	28.1	Dover Township.....	2,846	1,722	65.3
Washtenaw County.....	172,440	134,606	28.1	Holbrook Township.....	10,104	4,004	152.3
Asheville, N.C.....	130,074	124,403	4.6	Medfield Township.....	6,021	4,549	32.4
Buncombe County.....	130,074	124,403	4.6	Milton Township.....	26,375	22,395	17.8
Atlanta, Ga.....	1,017,188	726,989	39.9	Millis Township*.....	4,374	2,551	71.5
Clayton County.....	46,365	22,872	102.7	Norfolk Township.....	25,793	16,313	58.1
Cobb County.....	114,174	61,830	84.7	Norwood Township.....	24,898	16,636	49.7
De Kalb County.....	256,782	136,395	88.3	Randolph Township.....	18,900	9,982	89.3
Fulton County.....	556,326	473,572	17.5	Sharon Township.....	10,070	4,847	107.8
Gwinnett County.....	43,541	32,320	34.7	Walpole Township.....	14,068	9,109	54.4
Atlantic City, N.J.....	160,880	132,399	21.5	Wellesley Township.....	26,071	20,549	26.9
Atlantic County.....	160,880	132,399	21.5	Westwood Township.....	10,354	5,837	77.4
Augusta, Ga.-S.C.....	216,639	162,013	33.7	Weymouth Township.....	48,177	32,690	47.4
Richmond County, Ga.....	135,601	108,876	24.5	Plymouth County (part).....	74,290	43,914	69.2
Aiken County, S.C.....	81,038	53,137	52.5	Duxbury Township.....	4,727	3,167	49.3
Austin, Tex.....	212,136	160,980	31.8	Hanover Township.....	5,923	3,389	74.8
Travis County.....	212,136	160,980	31.8	Hingham Township.....	15,378	10,665	44.2
Bakersfield, Calif.....	291,984	228,309	27.9	Hull Township.....	7,055	3,379	108.8
Kern County.....	291,984	228,309	27.9	Marshfield Township.....	6,748	3,267	106.6
Baltimore, Md.....	1,727,023	1,405,399	22.9	Norwell Township.....	5,207	2,515	107.0
Baltimore City.....	939,024	949,708	-1.1	Pembroke Township.....	4,919	2,579	90.7
Anne Arundel County.....	206,634	117,392	76.0	Rockland Township.....	13,119	8,960	46.4
Baltimore County.....	492,428	270,273	82.2	Situate Township.....	11,214	5,993	87.1
Carroll County.....	52,785	44,907	17.5	Suffolk County.....	791,329	896,615	-11.7
Howard County.....	36,152	23,119	56.4	Boston City.....	697,197	801,444	-13.0
Baton Rouge, La.....	230,058	158,236	45.4	Chelsea City.....	33,749	38,912	-13.3
East Baton Rouge Parish.....	230,058	158,236	45.4	Revere City.....	40,080	36,763	9.0
Bay City, Mich.....	107,042	88,461	21.0	Winthrop Town.....	20,303	19,496	4.1
Bay County.....	107,042	88,461	21.0	Bridgeport, Conn.....	337,983	275,883	22.5
Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex.....	306,016	235,650	29.9	Fairfield County (part).....	296,321	249,018	19.0
Jefferson County.....	245,659	195,083	25.9	Bridgeport City.....	156,743	158,709	-1.2
Orange County.....	60,357	40,567	48.8	Shelton City.....	18,190	12,694	43.3
Billings, Mont.....	79,016	55,875	41.4	Easton Township.....	3,407	2,165	57.4
Yellowstone County.....	79,016	55,875	41.4	Fairfield Township.....	46,183	30,489	51.5
Binghamton, N.Y.-Pa.....	283,600	246,834	14.9	Monroe Township.....	6,402	2,892	121.4
Broome County, N.Y.....	212,661	184,698	15.1	Stratford Township.....	45,012	33,428	34.7
Tioga County, N.Y.*.....	37,802	30,166	25.3	Trumbull.....	20,379	8,641	135.8
Susquehanna County, Pa.*.....	33,137	31,970	3.7	New Haven County (part).....	41,662	26,870	55.1
Birmingham, Ala.....	634,864	558,928	13.6	Milford Township.....	41,662	26,870	55.1
Jefferson County.....	634,864	558,928	13.6	Brookton, Mass.....	149,458	119,728	24.8
Boise City, Idaho.....	93,460	70,649	32.3	Bristol County (part).....	9,078	6,244	45.4
Ada County.....	93,460	70,649	32.3	Easton Township.....	9,078	6,244	45.4
Boston, Mass.....	2,595,481	2,414,368	7.5	Norfolk County (part).....	20,629	13,812	49.4
Essex County (part).....	308,051	269,584	14.3	Avon Township.....	4,301	2,666	61.3
Beverly City.....	36,108	28,884	25.0	Stoughton Township.....	16,328	11,146	46.5
Lynn City.....	94,478	99,738	-5.3	Plymouth County (part).....	119,751	99,672	20.1
Peabody City.....	32,202	22,645	42.2	Brookton City.....	72,813	62,860	13.8
Salem City.....	39,211	41,880	-6.4	Abington Township.....	10,607	7,152	48.3
Danvers Township.....	21,926	15,720	39.5	Bridgewater Township.....	10,276	9,512	8.0
Hamilton Township.....	5,488	2,764	98.6	East Bridgewater Township.....	6,139	4,412	39.1
Lynnfield Township.....	8,398	3,927	113.9	Hanson Township.....	4,370	3,264	33.9
Manchester Township.....	3,932	2,868	37.1	West Bridgewater Township.....	5,061	4,059	24.7
Marblehead Township.....	18,521	13,765	34.6	Whitman Township.....	10,485	8,413	24.6
Middletown Township.....	3,718	2,916	27.5	Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex.....	151,098	125,170	20.7
Nahant Township.....	3,960	2,679	47.8	Cameron County.....	151,098	125,170	20.7
Saugus Township.....	20,666	17,162	20.4	Buffalo, N.Y.....	1,306,957	1,069,230	20.0
Swampscott Township.....	13,294	11,580	14.8	Erie County.....	1,064,688	899,238	18.4
Topsfield Township.....	3,351	1,412	137.3	Niagara County.....	242,269	189,992	27.5
Wenham Township.....	2,798	1,644	70.2	Canton, Ohio.....	340,345	283,194	20.2
Middlesex County (part).....	975,287	856,099	13.9	Stark County.....	340,345	283,194	20.2
Cambridge City.....	107,716	120,740	-10.8	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.....	136,899	104,274	31.3
Everett City.....	43,544	45,982	-5.3	Linn County.....	136,899	104,274	31.3
Malden City.....	57,676	59,804	-3.6	Champaign-Urbana, Ill.....	132,436	106,100	24.8
Medford City.....	64,971	66,113	-1.7	Champaign County.....	132,436	106,100	24.8
Melrose City.....	29,619	26,988	9.7	Charleston, S.C.....	254,578	195,107	30.5
Newton City.....	92,384	81,994	12.7	Berkeley County*.....	38,196	30,251	26.3
Somerville City.....	94,697	102,351	-7.5	Charleston County.....	216,382	164,856	31.3
Waltham City.....	55,413	47,187	17.4	Charleston, W.Va.....	252,925	239,629	5.5
Woburn City.....	31,214	20,492	52.3	Kanawha County.....	252,925	239,629	5.5
Arlington Township.....	49,953	44,353	12.6	Charlotte, N.C.....	316,781	239,086	32.5
Ashland Township.....	7,779	3,500	122.3	Mecklenburg County.....	272,111	197,052	38.1
Bedford Township.....	10,969	5,234	109.6	Union County*.....	44,670	42,034	6.3

18862

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

TABLE 1.—1960 and 1950 population of standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963—Continued

(Asterisk (*) identifies additions to standard metropolitan statistical areas as defined for 1960 census. Minus sign (—) denotes decrease)

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase	Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase
Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga.	283,169	246,453	14.9	Flint, Mich.	416,239	306,757	35.7
Hamilton County, Tenn.	237,905	208,255	14.2	Genesee County	374,313	270,963	38.1
Walker County, Ga.	45,264	38,198	18.5	Lapeer County*	41,926	35,794	17.1
Chicago, Ill.	6,220,913	5,177,868	20.1	Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla.	333,946	83,933	297.9
Cook County	5,129,725	4,508,792	13.8	Broward County	333,946	83,933	297.9
Du Page County	313,459	154,599	102.8	Fort Smith, Ark.-Okla.	135,110	141,978	-4.8
Kane County	208,246	150,388	38.5	Crawford County, Ark.*	21,318	22,727	-6.2
Lake County	293,656	179,097	64.0	Sebastian County, Ark.	66,685	64,202	3.9
McHenry County	84,210	50,656	66.2	Le Flore County, Okla.*	29,106	35,276	-17.5
Will County	191,617	134,336	42.6	Sequoyah County, Okla.*	18,001	19,773	-9.0
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ind.-Ky.	1,268,479	1,023,245	24.0	Fort Wayne, Ind.	232,196	183,722	26.4
Clermont County, Ohio*	80,530	42,182	90.9	Allen County	232,196	183,722	26.4
Hamilton County, Ohio	864,121	723,952	19.4	Fort Worth, Tex.	573,215	392,643	46.0
Warren County, Ohio*	65,711	38,505	70.7	Johnson County	34,720	31,390	10.6
Dearborn County, Ind.*	28,674	25,141	14.1	Tarrant County	538,495	361,253	49.1
Boone County, Ky.	21,940	13,015	68.6	Fresno, Calif.	365,945	276,515	32.3
Campbell County, Ky.	86,803	76,196	13.9	Fresno County	365,945	276,515	32.3
Kenton County, Ky.	120,700	104,254	15.8	Gadsden, Ala.	96,980	93,892	3.3
Cleveland, Ohio	1,909,483	1,532,574	24.6	Etowah County	96,980	93,892	3.3
Cuyahoga County	1,647,895	1,389,532	18.6	Galveston-Texas City, Tex.	140,364	113,066	24.1
Cuyahoga County*	47,573	26,646	78.5	Galveston County	140,364	113,066	24.1
Lake County	148,700	75,979	95.7	Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind.	573,548	408,228	40.5
Medina County*	65,315	40,417	61.6	Lake County	613,269	368,152	39.4
Colorado Springs, Colo.	143,742	74,523	92.9	Porter County	60,279	40,076	50.4
El Paso County	143,742	74,523	92.9	Grand Rapids, Mich.	461,906	362,043	27.6
Columbia, S.C.	260,828	186,844	39.6	Kent County	363,187	288,292	26.0
Lexington County	60,726	44,279	37.1	Ottawa County	98,719	73,751	33.9
Richland County	200,102	142,565	40.4	Great Falls, Mont.	73,418	53,027	38.5
Columbus, Ga.-Ala.	217,985	170,541	27.8	Cascade County	125,082	98,314	27.2
Chattahoochee County, Ga.	13,011	12,149	7.1	Green Bay, Wis.	125,082	98,314	27.2
Muskegon County, Ga.	158,623	118,028	34.4	Brown County	246,520	191,057	29.0
Russell County, Ala.	46,351	40,364	14.8	Greensboro-High Point, N.C.	246,520	191,057	29.0
Columbus, Ohio	754,924	563,040	34.1	Guilford County	246,520	191,057	29.0
Delaware County*	36,107	30,278	19.3	Greenville, S.C.	255,806	208,210	22.9
Franklin County	682,962	503,410	35.7	Greenville County	209,776	168,152	24.8
Pickaway County*	35,855	29,352	22.2	Pickens County*	46,030	40,058	14.9
Corpus Christi, Tex.	221,573	165,471	33.9	Hamilton-Middletown, Ohio	199,076	147,203	35.2
Nueces County	221,573	165,471	33.9	Butler County	199,076	147,203	35.2
Dallas, Tex.	1,083,601	743,501	45.7	Harrisburg, Pa.	371,653	317,023	17.2
Collin County	41,247	41,692	-1.1	Cumberland County	124,816	94,457	32.1
Dallas County	951,527	614,799	54.8	Dauphin County	220,255	197,784	11.4
Denton County	47,432	41,365	14.7	Perry County*	26,582	24,782	7.3
Ellis County	43,395	45,645	-4.9	Hartford, Conn.	549,249	420,000	30.8
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, Iowa-Ill.	319,375	280,748	13.8	Hartford County (part)	508,868	396,153	28.5
Scotts County, Iowa	119,067	100,698	18.2	Hartford City	162,178	177,397	-8.6
Henry County, Ill.	49,317	46,492	6.1	Avon Township	5,273	3,171	66.3
Rock Island County, Ill.	150,991	133,568	13.1	Bloomfield Township	13,613	5,746	136.9
Dayton, Ohio	727,121	545,723	33.2	Canton Township	4,783	3,613	32.4
Greene County	94,642	58,892	60.7	East Granby Township*	2,434	1,327	83.4
Miami County	72,901	61,309	18.9	East Hartford Township	43,977	29,933	46.9
Montgomery County	527,080	398,441	32.3	East Windsor Township	7,500	4,859	54.4
Freble County*	32,498	27,081	20.0	Enfield Township	31,464	15,464	103.5
Decatur, Ill.	118,257	98,853	19.6	Farmington Township	10,813	7,026	53.9
Macon County	118,257	98,853	19.6	Glastonbury Township	14,497	8,818	64.4
Denver, Colo.	929,383	612,125	51.8	Granby Town*	4,968	2,693	84.5
Adams County	120,296	40,234	199.0	Manchester Township	42,102	34,116	23.4
Arapahoe County	113,426	62,125	117.6	Newington Township	17,664	9,110	93.9
Boulder County	74,254	48,296	53.7	Rocky Hill Township	7,404	5,108	44.9
Denver County	493,887	415,786	18.8	Simsbury Township	10,138	4,822	108.2
Jefferson County	127,520	55,687	129.0	South Windsor Township	9,466	4,066	132.7
Des Moines, Iowa	266,315	226,010	17.8	Suffield Township	6,779	4,895	38.5
Polk County	266,315	226,010	17.8	West Hartford Township	62,382	44,402	40.5
Detroit, Mich.	3,762,360	3,016,197	24.7	Wethersfield Township	20,561	12,533	64.1
Macomb County	405,804	184,961	119.4	Windsor Township	19,467	11,833	64.5
Oakland County	690,259	396,001	74.3	Windsor Locks Township	11,411	5,221	118.6
Wayne County	2,666,297	1,435,235	9.5	Middlesex County (part)	6,780	4,286	58.2
Dubuque, Iowa	8,0048	71,337	12.2	Cromwell Township	6,780	4,286	58.2
Dubuque County	80,048	71,337	12.2	Tolland County (part)	33,601	19,570	71.7
Duluth-Superior, Minn.-Wis.	276,596	252,777	9.4	Andover Town*	1,771	1,034	71.3
St. Louis County, Minn.	231,588	206,062	12.4	Bolton Town*	2,933	1,279	129.3
Douglas County, Wis.	45,008	46,715	-3.7	Coventry Town*	6,356	4,043	57.2
Durham, N.C.	111,995	101,639	10.2	Ellington Town*	5,580	3,099	80.1
Durham County	111,995	101,639	10.2	Vernon Township	16,961	10,115	67.7
El Paso, Tex.	314,070	194,968	61.1	Honolulu, Hawaii	500,409	353,020	41.8
El Paso County	314,070	194,968	61.1	Honolulu County	500,409	353,020	41.8
Erie, Pa.	250,082	219,388	14.3	Houston, Tex.	1,243,158	806,701	54.1
Erie County	250,082	219,388	14.3	Harris County	1,243,158	806,701	54.1
Eugene, Oreg.	162,890	125,776	29.5	Huntington-Ashland, W.Va.-Ky.-Ohio	264,780	245,795	3.7
Lane County	222,890	212,664	4.8	Cabell County, W.Va.	108,202	108,035	.2
Evansville, Ind.-Ky.	165,794	160,422	3.3	Wayne County, W.Va.	38,977	38,696	.4
Vanderburgh County, Ind.	23,577	21,527	9.5	Bay County, Ky.	62,163	49,949	24.5
Warrick County, Ind.*	33,519	30,715	9.1	Lawrence County, Ohio	55,438	49,115	12.9
Henderson County, Ky.	138,156	137,298	0.6	Huntsville, Ala.	153,861	108,669	41.0
Fall River, Mass.-R.I.	128,695	131,639	-2.2	Limestone County*	36,513	35,766	2.1
Bristol County, Mass. (part)	99,942	111,963	-10.7	Madison County	117,348	72,903	61.0
Somerset Township	12,196	8,566	42.4	Indianapolis, Ind.	916,932	703,129	30.4
Swansea Township	9,916	6,121	62.0	Hamilton County*	40,132	28,491	40.9
Westport Township	6,641	4,989	33.1	Hancock County*	26,665	20,332	31.1
Newport County, R.I. (part)	9,461	5,669	67.2	Hendricks County*	40,896	24,594	66.3
Tiverton Township	9,461	5,669	67.2	Johnson County*	43,704	26,183	66.9
Fargo-Moorhead, N. Dak.-Minn.	106,027	89,240	18.8	Marion County	697,567	551,777	26.4
Cass County, N. Dak.	66,947	58,877	13.7	Morgan County*	33,875	23,726	42.8
Clay County, Minn.	39,080	30,363	28.7	Shelby County*	34,093	28,026	21.6
Fitchburg-Leominster, Mass.	90,188	80,528	12.0	Jackson, Mich.	131,994	107,925	22.3
Middlesex County (part)	8,852	7,088	24.9	Jackson County	131,994	107,925	22.3
Shirley Township	5,202	4,271	21.8	Jackson, Miss.	221,367	171,045	29.4
Townsend Township*	3,650	2,817	29.6	Hinds County	187,045	142,164	31.6
Worcester County (part)	81,306	73,440	10.7	Rankin County*	34,322	28,881	18.8
Fitchburg City	43,021	42,691	16.0	Jacksonville, Fla.	455,411	304,029	49.8
Leominster City	27,929	24,075	16.8	Duval County	455,411	304,029	49.8
Lunenburg Township	6,334	3,906	62.2	Jersey City, N.J.	610,734	647,437	-5.7
Westminster Township*	4,022	2,768	45.3	Hudson County	610,734	647,437	-5.7

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18863

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

TABLE 1.—1960 and 1950 population of standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963—Continued

[Asterisk (*) identifies additions to standard metropolitan statistical areas as defined for 1960 census. Minus sign (—) denotes decrease]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase	Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase
Johnstown, Pa.	280,733	291,354	-3.6	Memphis, Tenn.-Ark.	674,583	529,577	27.4
Cambria County	203,283	209,541	-3.0	Shelby County, Tenn.	627,017	492,893	30.0
Somerset County	77,450	81,813	-5.3	Crittenden County, Ark.*	47,504	47,184	0.8
Kalamazoo, Mich.	169,712	126,707	33.9	Meriden, Conn.	51,850	44,088	17.6
Kalamazoo County	169,712	126,707	33.9	New Haven County (part)	51,850	44,088	17.6
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans.	1,092,545	848,655	28.7	Meriden City	51,850	44,088	17.6
Cass County, Mo.*	20,702	19,325	53.7	Miami, Fla.	935,047	495,084	88.9
Clay County, Mo.	87,474	45,221	93.4	Dade County	935,047	495,084	88.9
Jackson County, Mo.	622,732	541,035	15.1	Midland, Tex.	67,717	25,785	162.6
Platte County, Mo.*	23,350	14,973	55.9	Midland County	67,717	25,785	162.6
Johnson County, Kans.	143,792	62,783	129.0	Milwaukee, Wis.	1,232,731	980,309	25.7
Wyandotte County, Kans.	185,495	165,318	12.2	Milwaukee County	1,036,041	871,047	18.9
Kenosha, Wis.	100,615	75,238	33.7	Ozaukee County*	38,441	23,361	64.6
Kenosha County	100,615	75,238	33.7	Waukesha County	158,249	85,901	84.2
Knoxville, Tenn.	368,080	337,105	9.2	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	1,482,030	1,151,653	28.8
Anderson County	60,032	59,407	1.1	Anoka County	859,916	35,579	141.5
Blount County	57,525	54,691	5.2	Dakota County	78,303	49,019	59.7
Knox County	250,523	223,007	12.3	Hennepin County	842,854	676,579	24.6
Lafayette, La. ²	84,656	57,743	46.6	Ramsey County	422,525	355,332	18.9
Lafayette Parish	84,656	57,743	46.6	Washington County	52,432	34,544	51.8
Lake Charles, La.	145,475	89,635	62.3	Mobile, Ala.	363,389	272,102	33.5
Calcasieu Parish	145,475	89,635	62.3	Baldwin County*	49,088	40,997	19.7
Lancaster, Pa.	278,359	234,717	18.6	Mobile County	314,301	231,105	36.6
Lancaster County	278,359	234,717	18.6	Monroe, La.	101,663	74,713	36.1
Lansing, Mich.	298,949	244,159	22.4	Ouachita Parish	101,663	74,713	36.1
Clinton County	37,969	31,195	21.7	Montgomery, Ala.	199,734	170,614	17.1
Eaton County	49,684	40,023	24.1	Elmore County*	30,524	31,649	-3.6
Ingham County	211,296	172,941	22.2	Montgomery County	169,210	138,965	21.8
Laredo, Tex.	64,791	56,141	15.4	Muncie, Ind.	110,938	90,253	22.9
Webb County	64,791	56,141	15.4	Delaware County	110,938	90,253	22.9
Las Vegas, Nev.	127,016	48,289	163.0	Muskegon-Muskegon Heights, Mich.	149,943	121,545	23.4
Clark County	127,016	48,289	163.0	Muskegon County	149,943	121,545	23.4
Lawrence-Haverhill, Mass.-N.H.	189,136	130,428	44.6	Nashville, Tenn.	463,628	381,609	21.5
Essex County, Mass. (part)	189,136	130,428	44.6	Davidson County	399,743	321,758	24.2
Lawrence City	70,933	80,536	-11.9	Sumner County*	36,217	33,533	8.0
Haverhill City	46,346	47,280	-2.0	Wilson County*	27,668	26,318	5.1
Andover Township	17,134	12,437	37.8	New Bedford, Mass.	143,176	141,984	0.8
Georgetown Township*	3,755	2,411	55.7	Bristol County (part)	137,178	137,469	-2
Groveland Township	3,297	2,340	40.9	New Bedford City	102,777	109,189	-6.1
Merrimac Township*	3,261	2,804	16.3	Acushnet Township	5,755	4,401	30.8
Methuen Township	28,114	24,477	14.9	Dartmouth Township	14,607	11,115	31.4
North Andover Township	10,908	8,485	28.6	Fairhaven Township	14,339	12,764	12.3
West Newbury Township*	1,844	1,698	15.4	Plymouth County (part)	5,988	4,515	32.8
Rockingham County, N.H. (part)	13,544	8,060	68.0	Marion Township	2,881	2,250	28.0
Newton Township*	1,419	1,173	21.0	Mattapoisett Township	3,117	2,265	37.6
Plaistow Township	2,915	2,652	40.0	New Britain, Conn.	129,397	104,251	24.1
Salem Township	9,210	4,805	91.7	Hartford County (part)	129,397	104,251	24.1
Lawton, Okla.	90,803	55,165	64.6	New Britain City	82,201	73,726	11.5
Comanche County	90,803	55,165	64.6	Berlin Township	11,250	7,470	50.6
Lewiston-Auburn, Maine	70,295	68,426	2.7	Plainville Township	13,149	9,994	31.6
Androscoggin County (part)	70,295	68,426	2.7	Southington Township	22,797	13,061	74.5
Auburn City	24,449	23,134	5.7	New Haven, Conn.	320,836	273,049	17.5
Lewiston City	40,804	40,974	-0.4	New Haven County (part)	320,836	273,049	17.5
Lisbon Township	5,042	4,318	16.8	New Haven City	152,048	164,443	-7.5
Lexington, Ky.	131,906	100,746	30.9	Bethany Township*	2,384	1,318	80.9
Fayette County	131,906	100,746	30.9	Branford Township	16,610	10,944	51.8
Lima, Ohio	103,691	88,189	17.6	East Haven Township	21,388	12,212	75.1
Allen County	103,691	88,189	17.6	Guilford Township	7,913	5,092	55.4
Lincoln, Neb.	155,272	119,742	29.7	Hamden Township	41,056	29,715	38.2
Lancaster County	155,272	119,742	29.7	North Branford Township*	6,771	2,017	235.7
Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.	242,980	196,685	23.5	North Haven Township	15,935	9,444	68.7
Pulaski County	242,980	196,685	23.5	Orange Township	8,547	3,032	181.9
Lorain-Elyria, Ohio	217,500	148,162	46.8	West Haven Township	43,002	32,010	34.3
Lorain County	217,500	148,162	46.8	Woodbridge Township	5,182	2,822	83.6
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.	6,038,771	4,151,687	45.5	New London-Groton-Norwich, Conn.	170,981	134,612	27.0
Los Angeles County	6,038,771	4,151,687	45.5	New London County (part)	170,981	134,612	27.0
Louisville, Ky.-Ind.	725,139	576,900	25.7	New London City	34,182	3,551	11.9
Jefferson County, Ky.	610,947	484,615	26.1	Norwich Township	38,506	37,633	2.3
Clark County, Ind.	62,795	48,330	29.9	Norwich City	38,506	23,429	64.4
Floyd County, Ind.	51,397	43,955	16.9	East Lyme Township	6,782	3,720	75.2
Lowell, Mass.	164,243	140,249	17.1	Griswold Township*	6,472	5,728	13.0
Middlesex County (part)	164,243	140,249	17.1	Groton Township	29,937	21,896	36.7
Lowell City	92,107	97,249	-5.3	Ledyard Township	5,395	1,749	208.5
Billerica Township	17,867	11,101	60.9	Lisbon Township*	2,019	1,282	57.5
Chelmsford Township	15,130	9,407	60.8	Montville Township	7,759	4,766	62.8
Draught Township	13,674	8,666	57.8	Old Lyme Township*	3,068	2,141	43.3
Tewksbury Township	15,902	7,505	111.9	Preston Township	4,992	1,775	181.2
Tyngsborough Township	3,302	2,059	60.4	Stonington Township	13,969	11,801	18.4
Westford Township*	6,261	4,262	46.9	Sprague Township*	2,509	2,320	8.1
Lubbock, Tex.	156,271	101,048	54.7	Waterford Township	15,391	9,100	69.1
Lubbock County	156,271	101,048	54.7	New Orleans, La.	907,123	712,393	27.3
Lynchburg, Va.	110,701	96,936	14.2	Jefferson Parish	208,769	103,873	101.0
Lynchburg City	54,790	47,727	14.8	Orleans Parish	627,525	570,445	10.0
Amherst County	22,953	20,332	12.9	St. Bernard Parish	32,186	11,087	190.3
Campbell County	22,953	20,332	12.9	St. Tammany Parish*	38,643	26,988	43.2
Macon, Ga.	136,403	135,043	33.6	New York, N.Y.	10,694,633	9,555,943	11.9
Bibb County	141,249	114,079	23.8	New York City	7,781,984	7,981,957	-1.4
Houston County	39,154	20,964	86.8	Bronx County	1,424,815	1,451,277	-1.8
Madison, Wis.	222,095	169,357	31.1	Kings County	2,627,319	2,738,175	-4.0
Dane County	222,095	169,357	31.1	New York County	1,698,281	1,960,101	-13.4
Manchester, N.H.	102,861	93,338	10.2	Queens County	1,809,578	1,550,849	16.7
Hillsborough County (part)	99,148	90,546	9.5	Richmond County	221,991	191,555	15.9
Manchester City	88,282	82,732	6.7	Nassau County	1,300,171	672,765	93.3
Bedford Township*	3,636	2,176	67.1	Rockland County	136,803	89,276	53.2
Goffstown Township	7,230	5,638	28.2	Suffolk County	666,784	276,129	141.5
Merrimack County (part)	3,713	2,792	33.0	Westchester County	808,891	625,816	29.3
Hooksett Township*	3,713	2,792	33.0				

18864

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

TABLE 1.—1960 and 1950 population of standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963—Continued

[Asterisk (*) identifies additions to standard metropolitan statistical areas as defined for 1960 census. Minus sign (—) denotes decrease]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase	Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase
Newark, N.J.	1,689,420	1,468,458	15.0	Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.-Mass.—Continued			
Essex County	923,545	905,949	1.9	Providence County, R.I.—Continued			
Morris County	261,620	164,371	59.2	Johnston Township	17,160	12,725	34.9
Union County	504,255	398,138	26.7	Lincoln Township	13,551	11,270	20.2
Newport News-Hampton, Va.	224,503	154,977	44.9	North Providence Township	18,220	13,927	30.8
Hampton City	89,258	260,994	46.3	North Smithfield Township	7,632	5,726	33.3
Newport News City	113,662	82,233	38.2	Smithfield Township	9,442	6,680	41.1
York County	21,583	11,750	83.7	Washington County, R.I. (part)	22,421	17,098	31.1
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.	578,507	446,200	29.7	Narragansett Township	3,444	2,288	50.5
Chesapeake City	73,647	110,371	—33.3	North Kingstown Township	18,977	14,810	28.1
Norfolk City	304,869	213,513	42.8	Bristol County, Mass. (part)	55,247	45,759	20.7
Portsmouth City	114,773	80,039	43.4	Attleboro City	27,118	23,809	13.9
Virginia Beach City	85,218	42,277	101.6	North Attleboro Township	14,777	12,146	21.7
Norwalk, Conn.	96,756	65,685	47.3	Rehoboth Township*	4,953	3,700	33.9
Fairfield County (part)	96,756	65,685	47.3	Seekonk Township	8,369	6,104	37.6
Norwalk City	67,776	49,460	37.0	Norfolk County, Mass. (part)	27,799	19,566	42.1
Westport Township	20,955	11,667	79.6	Bellingham Township	6,774	4,100	65.2
Wilton Township	8,026	4,558	76.1	Franklin Township	10,530	8,037	31.0
Odessa, Tex.	90,995	42,102	116.1	Plainville Township	3,810	2,088	82.5
Ector County	90,995	42,102	116.1	Wrentham Township	6,685	5,341	25.2
Ogden, Utah	110,744	83,319	32.9	Worcester County, Mass. (part)	6,697	6,660	0.6
Weber County	110,744	83,319	32.9	Blackstone Township	5,130	4,968	3.3
Oklahoma City, Okla.	511,833	392,439	30.4	Millville Township	1,567	1,692	—7.4
Canadian County	24,727	25,644	—3.6	Provo-Orem, Utah	106,991	81,912	30.6
Cleveland County	47,600	41,443	14.9	Utah County	106,991	81,912	30.6
Oklahoma County	439,506	325,352	35.1	Pueblo, Colo.	118,707	90,188	31.6
Omaha, Nebr.-Iowa	457,873	396,395	25.0	Pueblo County	118,707	90,188	31.6
Douglas County, Nebr.	343,490	281,020	22.2	Racine, Wis.	141,781	109,585	29.4
Sarpy County, Nebr.	31,281	15,683	99.3	Racine County	141,781	109,585	29.4
Pottawattamie County, Iowa	38,102	69,682	19.3	Raleigh, N.C.	169,082	136,450	23.9
Orlando, Fla.	263,540	114,950	129.3	Wake County	169,082	136,450	23.9
Orange County	54,947	26,883	104.4	Reading, Pa.	275,414	255,740	7.7
Seminole County	1,186,874	876,232	35.5	Berk County	275,414	255,740	7.7
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J.	780,255	539,139	44.7	Reno, Nev.	84,743	50,205	68.8
Bergen County	406,618	337,093	20.6	Washoe County	84,743	50,205	68.8
Passaic County	203,376	131,260	54.9	Richmond, Va.	436,044	350,035	24.6
Pensacola, Fla.	173,829	112,706	54.2	Richmond City	219,958	230,310	—4.5
Escambia County	29,547	18,554	59.2	Chesterfield County	71,197	40,400	76.2
Santa Rosa County	313,412	271,847	15.3	Hanover County*	27,550	21,985	25.3
Peoria, Ill.	189,044	174,347	8.4	Henrico County	117,339	57,340	104.6
Peoria County	99,789	76,165	31.0	Roanoke, Va.	158,803	133,407	19.0
Tazewell County	24,579	21,335	15.2	Roanoke City	97,110	91,921	5.6
Woodford County*	4,342,897	3,671,048	18.3	Roanoke County	61,693	41,486	48.7
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.	308,567	144,620	113.4	Rochester, N.Y.	732,588	615,044	19.1
Bucks County, Pa.	210,608	159,141	32.3	Livingston County*	44,053	40,257	9.4
Chester County, Pa.	553,154	414,234	33.5	Monroe County	586,387	487,632	20.3
Delaware County, Pa.	516,682	353,068	46.3	Orleans County*	34,159	29,832	14.5
Montgomery County, Pa.	2,002,512	2,071,605	—3.3	Wayne County*	67,989	57,323	18.6
Philadelphia County, Pa.	224,499	135,910	65.2	Rockford, Ill.	230,091	169,455	35.8
Burlington County, N.J.	392,035	300,743	30.4	Boone County*	20,326	17,070	19.1
Camden County, N.J.	134,840	91,727	47.0	Winnebago County	209,765	152,385	37.7
Gloucester County, N.J.	663,510	331,770	100.0	Sacramento, Calif.	625,503	359,429	74.0
Phoenix, Ariz.	663,510	331,770	100.0	Placer County*	56,998	41,049	36.9
Maricopa County	2,405,435	2,213,236	8.7	Sacramento County	562,778	277,140	81.4
Pittsburgh, Pa.	1,628,587	1,515,237	7.5	Yolo County*	65,727	40,040	61.7
Allegheny County	206,948	175,192	18.1	Saginaw, Mich.	190,752	153,515	24.3
Beaver County	217,271	209,628	3.6	Saginaw County	190,752	153,515	24.3
Washington County	352,629	313,179	12.6	St. Joseph, Mo.	90,581	96,826	—6.4
Westmoreland County	76,772	68,636	11.9	Buchanan County	90,581	96,826	—6.4
Pittsfield, Mass.	76,772	68,636	11.9	St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.	2,104,669	1,755,334	19.9
Berkshire County (part)	57,879	53,348	8.5	St. Louis City, Mo.	750,026	856,796	—12.5
Pittsfield City	6,436	4,772	34.9	Franklin County, Mo.*	44,566	36,046	23.6
Dalton Township	2,933	2,069	41.8	Jefferson County, Mo.	66,377	38,007	74.6
Lanesborough Township*	5,271	4,820	9.4	St. Charles County, Mo.	52,970	29,834	77.5
Lee Township	4,253	3,627	17.3	St. Louis County, Mo.	703,532	406,349	73.1
Lenox Township	139,122	133,983	3.8	Madison County, Ill.	224,689	182,307	23.2
Portland, Maine	139,122	133,983	3.8	St. Clair County, Ill.	262,509	205,995	27.4
Cumberland County (part)	72,566	77,634	—6.5	Salt Lake City, Utah	447,795	305,762	46.5
Portland City	22,788	21,866	4.2	Davis County*	64,760	30,867	109.8
Westbrook City	13,820	12,284	12.5	Salt Lake County	383,035	274,895	39.3
Cape Elizabeth Township	5,505	3,816	44.3	San Angelo, Tex.	64,630	58,929	9.7
Cumberland Township*	2,765	2,030	36.2	Tom Green County	64,630	58,929	9.7
Falmouth Township	5,976	4,342	37.6	San Antonio, Tex.	716,168	525,852	36.2
Gorham Township*	5,767	4,742	21.6	Bexar County	687,151	500,460	37.3
Scarborough Township*	6,418	4,600	39.5	Guadalupe County*	29,017	25,392	14.3
Yarmouth Township*	3,517	2,669	31.8	San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif.	809,782	451,688	79.3
Portland, Ore.-Wash.	821,897	704,829	16.6	San Bernardino County	306,191	170,046	80.1
Clackamas County, Ore.	113,038	80,716	39.4	San Bernardino County	503,591	281,642	78.8
Multnomah County, Ore.	522,813	471,537	10.9	San Diego, Calif.	1,033,011	556,808	85.5
Washington County, Ore.	92,237	61,269	50.5	San Diego County	1,033,011	556,808	85.5
Clark County, Wash.	93,809	85,307	10.0	San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.	2,648,762	2,135,934	24.0
Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.-Mass.	821,101	763,902	7.5	Alameda County	908,209	740,315	22.7
Bristol County, R.I.	37,146	29,079	27.7	Contra Costa County	409,030	298,984	36.8
Barrington Township	13,826	8,246	67.7	Marin County	146,820	85,619	71.5
Bristol Township	14,570	12,320	18.3	San Francisco County	740,316	775,357	—4.5
Warren Township	8,750	8,513	2.8	San Mateo County	444,387	235,059	88.6
Kent County, R.I. (part)	111,450	76,916	44.9	San Jose, Calif.	642,315	290,547	121.1
Warwick City	68,504	43,028	59.2	Santa Clara County	642,315	290,547	121.1
Coventry Township	15,432	9,869	56.4	Santa Barbara, Calif.	168,962	98,220	72.0
East Greenwich Township	6,100	4,923	23.9	Santa Barbara County	168,962	98,220	72.0
West Warwick Township	21,414	19,096	12.1	Savannah, Ga.	188,299	151,481	24.3
Newport County, R.I. (part)	2,267	2,068	9.6	Chatham County	188,299	151,481	24.3
Jamestown Township	2,267	2,068	9.6	Scranton, Pa.	234,531	257,396	—8.9
Providence County, R.I. (part)	558,074	566,756	—1.5	Lackawanna County	234,531	257,396	—8.9
Central Falls City	19,858	23,550	—15.7	Seattle, Wash.	1,107,213	844,572	31.1
Cranston City	66,766	55,060	21.3	King County	935,014	732,902	27.6
East Providence City	41,955	35,871	17.0	Snohomish County	172,199	111,580	54.3
Pawtucket City	81,001	81,436	—0.5	Shreveport, La.	281,481	216,688	29.9
Providence City	207,498	248,674	—16.6	Bossier Parish	57,622	40,139	43.6
Woonsocket City	47,080	50,211	—6.2	Caddo Parish	223,859	176,547	26.8
Burrillville Township	9,119	8,774	3.9	Sioux City, Iowa-Nebr.	120,017	114,318	5.0
Cumberland Township	18,792	12,842	46.3	Woodbury County, Iowa	107,849	103,917	3.8
				Dakota County, Nebr.*	12,168	10,401	17.0

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18865

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

TABLE 1.—1960 and 1950 population of standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963—Continued

(Asterisk (*) identifies additions to standard metropolitan statistical areas as defined for 1960 census. Minus sign (—) denotes decrease)

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase	Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	86,575	70,910	22.1	Tyler, Tex.	86,350	74,701	15.6
Minnehaha County	86,575	70,910	22.1	Smith County	86,350	74,701	15.6
South Bend, Ind.	271,057	234,526	15.6	Utica-Rome, N.Y.	330,771	284,262	16.4
Marshall County*	32,443	29,468	10.1	Herkimer County	66,370	61,407	8.1
St. Joseph County	238,614	205,058	16.4	Oneida County	264,401	222,855	18.6
Spokane, Wash.	278,333	221,561	25.6	Vallejo-Napa, Calif.	200,487	151,436	32.4
Spokane County	278,333	221,561	25.6	Napa County	65,890	46,603	41.4
Springfield, Ill.	146,539	131,484	11.5	Solano County	134,597	104,833	28.4
Sangamon County	146,539	131,484	11.5	Waco, Tex.	150,091	130,194	15.3
Springfield, Mo.	126,276	104,823	20.5	McLennan County	150,091	130,194	15.3
Greene County	126,276	104,823	20.5	Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va.	2,001,897	1,464,089	36.7
Springfield, Ohio	131,440	111,661	17.7	Washington, D.C.	763,956	802,178	-4.8
Clark County	131,440	111,661	17.7	Montgomery County, Md.	340,928	164,401	107.4
Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass.-Conn.	493,999	422,163	17.0	Prince Georges County, Md.	337,395	194,182	84.1
Hampden County, Mass. (part)	422,254	361,724	16.7	Alexandria City, Va.	91,023	61,787	47.3
Chicopee City	61,553	49,211	25.1	Fairfax City, Va.*	18,585	1,946	598.1
Holyoke City	52,689	54,661	-3.6	Falls Church City, Va.	10,182	7,535	35.3
Springfield City	174,463	162,399	7.4	Arlington County, Va.	163,401	135,449	20.6
Westfield City	26,302	20,962	25.5	Fairfax County, Va.	261,417	96,611	179.0
Agawam Township	15,718	10,166	54.6	Waterbury, Conn.	185,548	157,220	18.0
East Longmeadow Township	10,204	4,881	110.9	Litchfield County (part)	24,597	18,159	35.5
Hampden Township*	2,345	1,822	27.4	Thomaston Township	5,850	4,896	19.5
Longmeadow Township	10,565	6,508	62.3	Watertown Township	14,837	10,699	38.7
Ludlow Township	13,805	8,660	59.4	Woodbury Township*	3,910	2,564	52.5
Mendon Township	6,712	6,125	9.6	New Haven County (part)	160,951	139,061	15.7
Palmer Township	10,358	9,533	8.7	Waterbury City	107,130	104,477	2.5
Southwick Township*	5,139	2,855	80.0	Naugatuck Borough	19,511	17,455	11.8
West Springfield Township	24,924	20,438	21.9	Beacon Falls Township	2,886	2,067	39.6
Wilbraham Township	7,387	4,003	84.5	Cheshire Township	13,383	6,295	112.6
Hampshire County, Mass. (part)	64,660	54,402	18.9	Middlebury Township	4,785	3,318	44.2
Northampton City	30,058	29,063	3.4	Prospect Township	4,367	1,896	130.3
Easthampton Township	12,326	10,694	15.3	Wolcott Township	8,889	3,553	150.2
Granby Township*	4,221	1,861	126.8	Waterloo, Iowa	122,482	100,448	21.9
Hadley Township	3,099	2,639	17.4	Black Hawk County	122,482	100,448	21.9
South Hadley Township	14,956	10,145	47.4	West Palm Beach, Fla.	223,016	114,688	98.9
Worcester County, Mass. (part)	3,383	3,406	-7	Palm Beach County	223,106	114,688	98.9
Warren Township	3,383	3,406	-7	Wheeling, W. Va.-Ohio	190,342	196,305	-3.0
Tolland County, Conn. (part)	3,702	2,631	40.7	Ohio County, W. Va.	68,437	71,672	-4.5
Somers Township	3,702	2,631	40.7	Marshall County, W. Va.	38,041	36,893	3.1
Stamford, Conn.	178,409	134,896	32.3	Belmont County, Ohio	83,864	87,740	-4.4
Fairfield County (part)	178,409	134,896	32.3	Wichita, Kans.	381,626	253,291	50.7
Stamford City	92,713	74,293	24.8	Butler County*	38,395	31,001	23.9
Darien Township	18,437	11,767	56.7	Sodgwick County	343,231	222,290	54.4
Greenwich Township	53,793	40,835	31.7	Wichita Falls, Tex.	128,638	105,309	23.1
New Canaan Township	13,466	8,001	68.3	Wichita County	6,110	6,816	-10.4
Steuernville-Weirton, Ohio-W. Va.	167,756	157,787	6.3	Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Pa.	123,528	98,493	25.4
Jefferson County, Ohio	99,201	96,495	2.8	Luzerne County	346,972	392,241	-11.5
Brooke County, W. Va.	28,940	26,904	7.6	Wilmington, Del.-Md.-N.J.	346,972	392,241	-11.5
Hancock County, W. Va.	39,615	34,383	15.2	New Castle County, Del.	414,565	301,743	37.4
Stockton, Calif.	249,989	200,750	24.5	Cecil County, Md.*	307,446	218,879	40.5
San Joaquin County	249,989	200,750	24.5	Salem County, N.J.	48,408	33,356	45.1
Syracuse, N.Y.	563,781	465,114	21.2	Winston-Salem, N.C.	58,711	49,508	18.6
Madison County	54,635	46,214	18.2	Forsyth County	189,428	146,135	29.6
Onondaga County	423,028	341,719	23.8	Worcester, Mass.	328,898	306,269	7.4
Oswego County	86,118	77,181	11.6	Worcester County (part)	328,898	306,269	7.4
Tacoma, Wash.	321,590	275,876	16.6	Worcester City	186,587	203,486	-8.3
Pierce County	321,590	275,876	16.6	Auburn Township	14,047	8,840	58.9
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.	772,453	409,143	88.8	Berlin Township	1,742	1,349	29.1
Hillsborough County	397,788	249,894	59.2	Boylston Township	2,367	1,700	39.2
Pinellas County	374,665	159,249	135.3	Brookfield Township	1,751	1,567	11.7
Terre Haute, Ind.	172,069	172,468	-0.2	East Brookfield-Township	1,533	1,243	23.3
Clay County*	24,207	23,918	1.2	Grafton Township	10,627	8,281	28.3
Sullivan County*	21,721	23,667	-8.2	Holden Township	10,117	5,975	69.3
Vermillion County*	17,683	19,723	-10.3	Leicester Township	8,177	6,029	35.6
Vigo County	108,458	105,160	3.1	Millbury Township	9,623	8,347	15.3
Texarkana, Tex.-Ark.	91,657	94,580	-3.1	Northborough Township	6,687	3,122	114.2
Bowie County, Tex.	59,971	61,966	-3.2	Northbridge Township	10,800	10,476	3.1
Miller County, Ark.	31,686	32,614	-2.8	North Brookfield Township	3,616	3,444	5.0
Toledo, Ohio-Mich.	630,647	530,822	18.8	Oxford Township	9,282	5,851	58.6
Lucas County, Ohio	456,931	395,551	15.5	Paxton Township*	2,399	1,066	125.0
Wood County, Ohio*	72,596	59,605	21.8	Shrewsbury Township	16,622	10,594	56.9
Monroe County, Mich.*	101,120	75,666	33.6	Sterling Township*	7,838	7,027	11.5
Topeka, Kans.	141,286	105,418	34.0	Sutton Township	3,193	2,166	47.4
Shawnee County	141,286	105,418	34.0	Upton Township	3,638	3,102	17.3
Trenton, N.J.	266,392	229,781	15.9	Westborough Township	3,127	2,656	17.7
Mercer County	266,392	229,781	15.9	Westbrook Township	9,599	7,378	30.1
Tucson, Ariz.	265,660	141,216	88.1	West Boylston Township	5,526	2,670	115.0
Pima County	265,660	141,216	88.1	York, Pa.	290,242	246,934	17.5
Tulsa, Okla.	418,974	327,900	27.8	Adams County*	51,906	44,197	17.4
Creek County	40,495	43,143	-6.1	York County	238,336	202,737	17.6
Osage County	32,441	33,071	-1.9	Youngstown-Warren, Ohio	509,006	416,544	22.2
Tulsa County	346,038	251,686	37.5	Mahoning County	300,480	257,629	16.6
Tuscaloosa, Ala.	109,047	94,092	15.9	Trumbull County	208,526	158,915	31.2
Tuscaloosa County	109,047	94,092	15.9				

* New area formed by detachment of Orange County from Los Angeles-Long Beach SMSA.

* New area.

* Includes population (55,028) of Elizabeth City County which was consolidated with Hampton City between 1950 and 1960.

* Includes population (39,875) of Warwick County which was consolidated with Newport News City between 1950 and 1960.

* Population shown is that of South Norfolk City and Norfolk County, which were consolidated as Chesapeake City Jan. 1, 1963.

* Population shown is that of Virginia Beach City and Princess Anne County, which were consolidated Jan. 1, 1963.

* New area formed by detachment of Solano County from San Francisco-Oakland SMSA and addition of Napa County.

* Fairfax Township became independent city after Apr. 1, 1960 1950 population excluded from 1950 population of Fairfax County.

18866

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

TABLE 2.—1960 and 1950 population inside and outside central city or cities of standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963

[Minus sign (—) denotes decrease. Percent not shown where less than 0.1]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase	Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase
United States (216 areas).....	115,795,265	91,568,113	26.5	Brockton, Mass.....	149,458	119,728	24.8
In central cities.....	58,441,995	52,648,185	11.0	Brockton.....	72,813	62,860	15.8
Outside central cities.....	57,354,270	38,919,928	47.4	Outside central city.....	76,645	56,868	34.8
Abilene, Tex.....	120,377	85,517	40.8	Brownsville, Harlingen-San Benito, Tex.....	151,098	125,170	20.7
Abilene.....	90,368	45,570	98.3	In central cities.....	105,669	72,566	45.6
Outside central city.....	30,009	39,947	-24.9	Brownsville.....	48,040	36,066	33.2
Akron, Ohio.....	608,367	473,986	27.7	Harlingen.....	41,207	23,229	77.4
Akron.....	290,351	274,605	5.7	San Benito.....	16,422	13,271	23.7
Outside central city.....	318,016	199,381	58.0	Outside central cities.....	45,429	52,604	13.6
Albany, Ga.....	75,680	43,617	73.5	Buffalo, N.Y.....	1,306,957	1,089,230	20.0
Albany.....	55,890	31,155	79.4	Buffalo.....	532,759	580,132	-8.2
Outside central city.....	19,790	12,462	58.8	Outside central city.....	774,198	509,098	52.1
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y.....	657,503	589,359	11.6	Canton, Ohio.....	340,345	283,194	20.2
In central cities.....	278,900	299,091	-6.8	Canton.....	113,631	116,621	-2.8
Albany.....	129,726	134,995	-3.9	Outside central city.....	226,714	166,572	36.3
Schenectady.....	81,682	91,785	-11.0	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.....	136,899	104,274	31.3
Troy.....	87,492	73,511	-6.7	Cedar Rapids.....	92,035	72,296	27.3
Outside central cities.....	378,603	290,268	30.4	Outside central city.....	44,864	31,978	40.3
Albuquerque, N. Mex.....	282,199	145,673	80.0	Champaign-Urbana, Ill.....	132,436	106,100	24.8
Albuquerque.....	201,189	96,815	107.8	In central cities.....	76,877	62,397	23.2
Outside central city.....	61,010	48,858	24.9	Champaign.....	49,583	39,563	25.3
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa., and New Jersey.....	492,168	437,824	12.4	Urbana.....	27,294	22,894	19.5
In central cities.....	215,710	208,728	3.3	Outside central cities.....	55,559	43,708	27.1
Allentown.....	108,347	106,756	1.5	Charleston, S.C.....	254,578	195,107	30.5
Bethlehem.....	75,408	66,340	13.7	Charleston.....	65,925	70,174	-6.1
Easton.....	31,955	35,632	-10.6	Outside central city.....	188,653	124,933	51.0
Outside central cities.....	276,458	229,096	20.7	Charleston, W. Va.....	252,925	239,620	5.5
Altoona, Pa.....	137,270	139,514	-1.6	Charleston.....	85,796	73,501	16.7
Altoona.....	69,407	77,177	-10.1	Outside central city.....	167,129	166,128	.6
Outside central city.....	67,863	62,337	8.9	Charlotte, N.C.....	316,781	239,086	32.5
Amarillo, Tex.....	149,493	87,140	71.6	Charlotte.....	201,564	134,042	50.4
Amarillo.....	137,969	74,246	85.8	Outside central city.....	115,217	105,044	9.7
Outside central city.....	11,524	12,894	-10.6	Chattanooga, Tenn., and Georgia.....	283,169	246,453	14.9
Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove, Calif.....	703,925	216,224	225.6	Chattanooga.....	130,009	131,041	-8.7
In central cities.....	288,772	60,089	380.8	Outside central city.....	153,160	115,412	32.7
Anaheim.....	104,184	14,556	615.7	Chicago, Ill.....	6,220,913	5,177,868	20.1
Santa Ana.....	100,350	45,533	120.4	Chicago.....	3,550,404	3,620,962	-1.9
Outside central cities.....	415,153	186,135	165.9	Outside central city.....	2,670,509	1,556,906	71.5
Ann Arbor, Mich.....	172,440	134,606	28.1	Chicopee. (See Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass.).....			
Ann Arbor.....	67,340	48,251	39.6	Cincinnati, Ohio, Indiana and Kentucky.....	1,268,479	1,023,245	24.0
Outside central city.....	105,100	86,355	21.7	Cincinnati.....	502,550	503,998	-0.3
Asheville, N.C.....	130,074	124,403	4.6	Outside central city.....	765,929	519,247	47.5
Asheville.....	60,192	53,000	13.6	Cleveland, Ohio.....	1,909,483	1,532,574	24.6
Outside central city.....	69,882	71,403	-2.1	Cleveland.....	876,060	914,808	-4.2
Ashland. (See Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ky., Ohio.).....				Outside central city.....	1,033,433	617,766	67.3
Atlanta, Ga.....	1,017,188	726,989	39.9	Clifton. (See Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J.).....			
Atlanta.....	487,455	331,214	47.1	Colorado Springs, Colo.....	143,742	74,523	92.9
Outside central city.....	529,733	395,775	33.9	Colorado Springs.....	70,194	45,472	54.4
Atlantic City, N.J.....	160,580	132,399	21.5	Outside central city.....	73,548	29,051	153.2
Atlantic City.....	59,544	61,657	-3.4	Columbia, S.C.....	260,828	186,844	39.6
Outside central city.....	101,336	70,742	43.2	Columbia.....	97,433	86,914	12.1
Auburn. (See Lewiston-Auburn, Maine.).....				Outside central city.....	163,395	99,930	63.5
Augusta, Ga.-S.C.....	216,639	162,013	33.7	Columbus, Ga.-Ala.....	217,985	170,541	27.8
Augusta.....	70,626	71,508	-1.2	Columbus.....	116,779	79,611	46.7
Outside central city.....	146,013	90,505	61.3	Outside central city.....	101,206	90,930	11.3
Austin, Tex.....	212,136	160,980	31.8	Columbus, Ohio.....	754,924	563,040	34.1
Austin.....	186,545	132,459	40.8	Columbus.....	471,816	375,901	25.4
Outside central city.....	25,591	28,521	-10.3	Outside central city.....	283,608	187,139	51.5
Bakersfield, Calif.....	291,984	228,309	27.9	Corpus Christi, Tex.....	221,573	165,471	33.9
Bakersfield.....	56,848	34,784	63.4	Corpus Christi.....	167,690	108,287	54.9
Outside central city.....	235,136	193,525	21.5	Outside central city.....	83,883	67,184	24.7
Baltimore, Md.....	1,727,023	1,405,399	22.9	Dallas, Tex.....	1,083,601	743,501	45.7
Baltimore.....	939,024	949,708	-1.1	Dallas.....	679,684	434,462	56.4
Outside central city.....	787,999	455,691	72.9	Outside central city.....	403,917	309,039	30.7
Baton Rouge, La.....	230,058	158,236	45.4	Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, Iowa-Ill.....	319,375	280,748	13.8
Baton Rouge.....	152,419	125,629	21.3	In central cities.....	183,549	160,656	14.2
Outside central city.....	77,639	32,607	138.1	Davenport.....	88,981	74,549	19.4
Bay City, Mich.....	107,042	88,461	21.0	Rock Island.....	51,863	48,710	6.5
Bay City.....	53,604	52,523	2.1	Moline.....	42,705	37,397	14.2
Outside central city.....	53,438	35,938	48.7	Outside central cities.....	135,826	120,092	13.1
Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex.....	306,016	235,650	29.9	Dayton, Ohio.....	727,121	545,723	33.2
In central cities.....	185,851	151,544	22.6	Dayton.....	262,332	243,872	7.6
Beaumont.....	119,175	94,014	26.8	Outside central city.....	464,789	301,851	54.0
Port Arthur.....	66,676	57,530	15.9	Decatur, Ill.....	118,257	98,853	19.6
Outside central cities.....	120,165	84,106	42.9	Decatur.....	78,004	66,269	17.7
Bethlehem. (See Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa., and New Jersey.).....				Outside central city.....	40,253	32,584	23.5
Billings, Mont.....	79,016	55,875	41.4	Denver, Colo.....	929,383	612,128	51.8
Billings.....	52,851	31,834	66.0	Denver.....	493,887	415,786	18.8
Outside central city.....	26,165	24,041	8.8	Outside central city.....	435,496	196,342	121.8
Binghamton, N.Y.....	283,600	246,834	14.9	Des Moines, Iowa.....	266,315	226,010	17.8
Binghamton.....	75,941	80,674	-5.9	Des Moines.....	208,982	177,965	17.4
Outside central city.....	207,659	166,160	25.0	Outside central city.....	57,333	48,045	19.3
Birmingham, Ala.....	634,864	558,928	13.6	Detroit, Mich.....	3,762,360	3,016,197	24.7
Birmingham.....	340,887	326,037	4.6	Detroit.....	1,670,144	1,849,568	-9.7
Outside central city.....	293,977	232,891	26.2	Outside central city.....	2,092,216	1,166,629	78.3
Boise City, Idaho.....	93,460	70,649	32.3	Dubuque, Iowa.....	80,048	71,337	12.2
Boise City.....	34,481	34,393	.3	Dubuque.....	56,606	49,671	14.0
Outside central city.....	58,979	36,256	62.7	Outside central city.....	23,442	21,666	8.2
Boston, Mass.....	2,595,481	2,414,368	7.5	Duluth-Superior, Minn.-Wis.....	276,596	252,777	9.4
Boston.....	697,197	801,444	-13.0	In central cities.....	140,447	139,836	.4
Outside central city.....	1,898,284	1,612,924	17.7	Duluth.....	106,884	104,511	2.3
Bridgeport, Conn.....	337,983	275,888	22.5	Superior.....	33,563	35,325	-5.0
Bridgeport.....	156,748	158,709	-1.2	Outside central cities.....	136,149	112,941	20.5
Outside central city.....	181,235	117,179	54.7	Durham, N.C.....	111,995	101,639	10.2
				Durham.....	78,302	71,311	9.8
				Outside central city.....	33,693	30,328	11.1

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18867

TABLE 2.—1960 and 1950 population inside and outside central city or cities of standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963—Continued

(Minus sign (—) denotes decrease. Percent not shown where less than 0.1)

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase	Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase
East Chicago. (See Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind.)				High Point (see Greensboro-High Point, N.C.)			
Easton. (See Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa.-N.J.)				Hollywood (see Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla.)			
El Paso, Tex.	314,070	194,968	61.1	Holyoke (see Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass.)			
El Paso	276,687	130,485	112.0	Honolulu, Hawaii	500,409	353,020	41.8
Outside central city	37,383	64,483	-42.0	Honolulu	294,194	248,034	18.6
Elyria. (See Lorain-Elyria, Ohio.)				Outside central city	206,215	104,986	96.4
Erie, Pa.	250,682	219,388	14.3	Houston, Tex.	1,243,158	806,701	54.1
Erie	138,440	130,803	5.8	Houston	938,219	596,163	57.4
Outside central city	112,242	88,585	26.7	Outside central city	304,939	210,538	44.8
Eugene, Oreg.	162,890	125,776	29.5	Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ky.-Ohio	254,780	245,795	3.7
Eugene	50,977	35,879	42.1	In central cities	114,910	117,484	-2.2
Outside central city	111,913	89,897	24.5	Huntington	83,627	86,563	-3.2
Evansville, Ind.-Ky.	222,890	212,664	4.8	Ashland	31,283	31,131	0.5
Evansville	141,543	128,636	10.0	Outside central cities	139,870	128,311	9.0
Outside central city	81,347	84,028	-3.2	Huntsville, Ala.	153,861	108,669	41.6
Fall River, Mass.-R.I.	138,156	137,298	0.6	Huntsville	72,865	16,437	340.3
Fall River	99,942	111,963	-10.7	Outside central city	81,496	92,232	-11.6
Outside central city	38,214	25,335	50.8	Indianapolis, Ind.	416,932	703,129	30.4
Fargo-Moorhead, N. Dak.-Minn.	106,027	89,240	18.8	Indianapolis	476,258	427,173	11.5
In central cities	69,596	53,126	31.0	Outside central city	440,674	275,956	59.7
Fargo	46,662	38,256	22.0	Jackson, Mich.	131,994	107,925	22.3
Moorhead	22,934	14,870	54.2	Jackson	59,720	51,088	16.0
Outside central cities	36,431	36,114	0.9	Outside central city	81,274	56,837	43.0
Fitchburg-Leominster, Mass.	90,158	80,528	12.0	Jackson, Miss.	221,367	171,045	29.4
In central cities	70,950	66,766	6.3	Jackson	144,422	98,271	47.0
Fitchburg	43,021	42,691	0.8	Outside central city	76,945	72,774	5.7
Leominster	27,929	24,075	16.0	Jacksonville, Fla.	455,411	304,029	49.8
Outside central cities	19,208	13,762	39.6	Jacksonville	201,030	204,517	-1.7
Flint, Mich.	416,239	306,757	35.7	Outside central city	254,381	99,512	155.6
Flint	196,940	163,143	20.7	Jersey City, N.J.	610,734	647,437	-5.7
Outside central city	219,299	143,614	52.7	Jersey City	276,101	299,017	-7.7
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla.	333,946	83,933	297.9	Outside central city	334,633	348,420	-4.0
In central cities	118,885	50,679	134.6	Johnstown, Pa.	280,733	291,354	-3.6
Fort Lauderdale	83,648	36,328	130.3	Johnstown	53,949	63,232	-14.7
Hollywood	35,237	14,351	145.5	Outside central city	226,784	228,122	-0.6
Outside central cities	215,061	33,254	546.7	Kalamazoo, Mich.	169,712	126,707	33.9
Fort Smith, Ark.-Okla.	135,110	141,978	-4.8	Kalamazoo	82,089	57,704	42.3
Fort Smith	52,991	47,942	10.5	Outside central city	87,623	69,003	27.0
Outside central city	82,119	94,036	-12.7	Kansas City, Mo.-Kans.	1,092,545	848,655	28.7
Fort Wayne, Ind.	232,196	183,722	26.4	Kansas City	475,539	456,622	4.1
Fort Wayne	161,776	133,607	21.1	Outside central city	617,006	392,033	57.4
Outside central city	70,420	50,115	40.5	Kenosha, Wis.	100,615	75,238	33.7
Fort Worth, Tex.	573,215	392,643	46.0	Kenosha	67,899	54,368	24.9
Fort Worth	356,268	278,778	27.8	Outside central city	32,716	20,870	56.8
Outside central city	216,947	113,865	90.5	Knoxville, Tenn.	368,080	337,105	9.2
Fresno, Calif.	365,945	270,515	32.3	Outside central city	111,827	124,769	-10.4
Outside central city	139,929	91,669	46.1	Knoxville	256,253	212,336	20.7
Gadsden, Ala.	232,016	134,846	25.5	Lafayette, La.	84,656	57,743	46.6
Gadsden	96,980	93,892	4.3	Lafayette	49,400	33,541	46.9
Outside central city	58,088	55,725	4.2	Outside central city	44,256	24,202	82.9
Galveston-Texas City, Tex.	140,364	113,066	24.1	Lake Charles, La.	145,475	89,635	62.3
In central cities	99,240	83,188	19.3	Lake Charles	63,392	41,272	53.6
Galveston	67,175	66,568	0.9	Outside central city	82,083	48,363	69.7
Texas City	32,065	16,620	92.9	Lancaster, Pa.	278,359	234,717	18.6
Outside central cities	41,124	29,878	37.6	Lancaster	61,055	63,774	-4.3
Garden Grove (see Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove, Calif.)				Outside central city	217,304	170,943	27.1
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind.	573,548	408,228	40.5	Lansing, Mich.	298,949	244,159	22.4
In central cities	347,687	275,768	26.1	Lansing	107,807	92,129	17.0
Gary	178,320	133,911	33.2	Outside central city	191,142	152,030	25.7
Hammond	111,698	87,594	27.5	Laredo, Tex.	64,791	56,141	15.4
East Chicago	57,669	54,263	6.3	Outside central city	60,678	51,910	16.9
Outside central cities	225,861	132,460	70.5	Las Vegas, Nev.	127,016	48,289	163.0
Grand Rapids, Mich.	461,906	362,043	27.6	Las Vegas	64,405	24,624	161.6
Grand Rapids	177,313	176,515	0.5	Outside central city	62,611	23,665	164.6
Outside central city	284,593	185,528	53.4	Lawrence-Haverhill, Mass.-N.H.	199,136	190,428	4.6
Great Falls, Mont.	73,418	53,027	38.5	In central cities	117,279	127,816	-8.2
Great Falls	55,244	39,214	40.9	Lawrence	70,933	80,536	-11.9
Outside central city	18,174	13,813	31.6	Haverhill	46,346	47,280	-2.0
Green Bay, Wis.	125,082	98,314	27.2	Outside central cities	81,857	62,612	30.7
Green Bay	62,888	52,735	19.3	Lawton, Okla.	90,803	55,165	64.6
Outside central city	62,194	45,579	36.5	Lawton	61,697	34,757	77.5
Greensboro-High Point, N.C.	246,520	191,057	28.0	Outside central city	29,106	20,408	42.6
In central cities	181,637	114,362	58.8	Leominster (see Fitchburg-Leominster, Mass.)			
Greensboro	119,574	74,389	60.7	Lewiston-Auburn, Maine	70,295	68,426	2.7
High Point	62,063	39,973	55.3	In central cities	65,253	64,108	1.8
Outside central cities	64,883	76,695	-15.4	Lewiston	40,804	40,974	-0.4
Greenville, S.C.	255,806	208,210	22.9	Auburn	24,449	23,134	5.7
Greenville	66,188	58,161	13.8	Outside central cities	5,042	4,318	16.8
Outside central city	189,618	150,049	26.4	Lexington, Ky.	131,906	100,746	30.9
Hamilton-Middletown, Ohio	199,076	147,203	35.2	Lexington	62,810	55,534	13.1
In central cities	114,469	91,646	24.9	Outside central city	69,096	45,212	52.8
Hamilton	72,354	57,951	24.9	Lima, Ohio	103,691	88,183	17.6
Middletown	42,115	33,695	25.0	Lima	51,037	50,246	1.6
Outside central cities	84,607	55,557	52.3	Outside central city	52,654	37,937	38.8
Hammond (see Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind.)				Lincoln, Nebr.	155,272	119,742	29.7
Hampton (see Newport News-Hampton, Va.)				Lincoln	128,521	98,884	30.0
Harlingen (see Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex.)				Outside central city	26,751	20,858	28.3
Harrisburg, Pa.	371,653	317,023	17.2	Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.	242,980	196,685	23.5
Harrisburg	79,697	89,544	-11.0	In central cities	165,845	146,310	13.4
Outside central city	291,956	227,479	28.3	Little Rock	107,813	102,213	5.5
Hartford, Conn.	549,249	420,009	30.8	North Little Rock	58,032	44,097	31.6
Hartford	162,178	177,397	-8.6	Outside central cities	77,135	50,375	53.1
Outside central city	387,071	242,612	59.5	Long Beach (see Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.)			
Haverhill (see Lawrence-Haverhill, Mass.-N.H.)				Lorain-Elyria, Ohio	217,500	148,162	46.8
Hazleton (see Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Pa.)				In central cities	112,714	81,509	38.3
				Lorain	68,932	51,202	34.6
				Elyria	43,782	30,307	44.5
				Outside central cities	104,786	66,653	57.2

18868

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

TABLE 2.—1960 and 1950 population inside and outside central city or cities of standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963—Continued

[Minus sign (—) denotes decrease. Percent not shown where less than 0.1]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase	Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.	6,038,771	4,151,687	45.5	Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.	578,507	446,200	29.7
In central cities	2,823,183	2,221,125	27.1	In central cities	419,642	293,552	43.0
Los Angeles	2,479,015	1,970,358	25.8	Norfolk	34,869	213,513	42.8
Long Beach	344,168	250,767	37.2	Portsmouth	114,773	80,039	43.4
Outside central cities	3,215,588	1,930,562	66.6	Outside central cities	158,865	152,648	4.1
Louisville, Ky.-Ind.	725,139	576,900	25.7	North Little Rock (see Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.)			
Louisville	390,639	369,129	5.8	Norwalk, Conn.	96,756	65,685	47.3
Outside central city	334,500	207,771	61.0	Norwalk	67,775	49,460	37.0
Lowell, Mass.	104,243	140,249	17.1	Outside central city	28,981	16,225	78.6
Lowell	92,107	97,249	-5.3	Norwich (see New London-Groton-Norwich, Conn.)			
Outside central city	12,136	43,000	67.8	Oakland (see San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.)			
Lubbock, Tex.	156,271	101,048	54.7	Odessa, Tex.	90,995	42,102	116.1
Lubbock	128,691	71,747	79.4	Odessa	80,338	29,495	172.4
Outside central city	27,580	29,301	-5.9	Outside central city	10,657	12,607	-15.5
Lynchburg, Va.	110,701	96,936	14.2	Ogden, Utah	110,744	83,319	32.9
Lynchburg	54,790	47,727	14.8	Ogden	70,197	57,112	22.9
Outside central city	55,911	49,209	13.6	Outside central city	40,547	26,207	54.7
Macon, Ga.	180,403	135,043	33.6	Oklaoma City, Okla.	511,833	392,439	30.4
Macon	69,764	70,252	-0.7	Oklaoma City	324,253	243,504	33.2
Outside central city	110,639	64,791	70.8	Outside central city	187,580	148,935	25.9
Madison, Wis.	222,095	169,357	31.1	Omaha, Nebr.-Iowa	457,873	366,395	25.0
Madison	126,706	96,050	31.9	Omaha	301,598	251,117	20.1
Outside central city	95,389	73,301	30.1	Outside central city	156,275	115,278	35.6
Manchester, N.H.	102,861	93,338	10.2	Ontario (see San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif.)			
Manchester	88,282	82,732	6.7	Orem (see Provo-Orem, Utah)			
Outside central city	14,579	10,606	37.5	Orlando, Fla.	318,487	141,833	124.6
Memphis, Tenn.-Ark.	674,583	529,577	27.4	Orlando	88,135	52,367	68.3
Memphis	497,524	396,000	25.6	Outside central city	230,352	89,466	157.5
Outside central city	177,059	133,577	32.6	Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J.			
Meriden, Conn.	61,850	44,088	17.6	In central cities	279,710	261,549	6.9
Meriden	51,850	44,088	17.6	Paterson	143,663	139,336	3.1
Miami, Fla.	935,047	495,084	88.9	Clifton	62,084	64,511	27.2
Miami	291,688	249,276	17.0	Passaic	53,963	57,702	-6.5
Outside central city	643,359	245,808	161.7	Outside central cities	907,163	614,683	47.6
Middletown (see Hamilton-Middletown, Ohio)				Pawtucket (see Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.-Mass.)			
Midland, Tex.	67,717	25,785	162.6	Pensacola, Fla.	203,376	131,260	54.9
Midland	62,625	21,713	188.4	Pensacola	56,752	43,479	30.5
Outside central city	5,092	4,072	25.0	Outside central city	146,624	87,781	67.0
Milwaukee, Wis.	1,232,781	980,309	25.7	Peoria, Ill.	313,412	271,847	15.3
Milwaukee	741,324	637,392	16.3	Peoria	103,162	111,556	-7.8
Outside central city	491,407	342,917	43.3	Outside central city	210,250	159,991	31.4
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	1,482,030	1,151,053	28.8	Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.	3,342,897	3,671,048	18.3
In central cities	796,283	833,067	-4.4	Philadelphia	2,002,512	2,071,605	-3.3
Minneapolis	482,872	521,718	-7.4	Outside central city	2,340,385	1,599,443	46.3
St. Paul	313,411	311,349	.7	Phoenix, Ariz.	663,510	331,770	100.0
Outside central cities	685,747	317,986	115.7	Phoenix	439,170	106,818	311.1
Mobile, Ala.	363,389	272,102	33.5	Outside central city	224,340	224,952	-0.3
Mobile	194,856	129,009	51.0	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,405,435	2,213,236	8.7
Outside central city	168,533	143,093	17.8	Pittsburgh	604,332	676,806	-10.7
Moline (see Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, Iowa-Ill.)				Outside central city	1,801,103	1,536,430	17.2
Monroe, La.	101,663	74,713	36.1	Pittsfield, Mass.	76,772	68,636	11.9
Monroe	52,219	38,572	35.4	Pittsfield	57,879	53,348	8.5
Outside central city	49,444	36,141	36.8	Outside central city	18,893	15,288	23.6
Montgomery, Ala.	199,734	170,614	17.1	Port Arthur (see Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex.)			
Montgomery	134,393	106,525	26.2	Portland, Maine	139,122	133,983	3.8
Outside central city	65,341	64,089	2.0	Portland	72,566	77,634	-6.5
Moorhead (see Fargo-Moorhead, N. Dak.-Minn.)				Outside central city	66,556	56,349	18.1
Muncie, Ind.	110,938	90,282	22.9	Portland, Oreg.-Wash.	821,897	703,829	16.6
Muncie	68,603	58,479	17.3	Portland	372,676	373,628	-0.3
Outside central city	42,335	31,773	33.2	Outside central city	449,221	331,201	35.6
Muskegon-Muskegon Heights, Mich.	149,943	121,546	23.4	Portsmouth (see Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.)			
In central cities	66,037	67,257	-1.8	Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.-Mass.			
Muskegon	46,485	48,429	-4.0	In central cities	821,101	763,902	7.5
Muskegon Heights	19,552	18,828	3.8	Providence	288,499	330,110	-12.6
Outside central cities	83,906	54,288	54.6	Pawtucket	207,498	248,674	-16.6
Muskegon Heights (see Muskegon-Muskegon Heights, Mich.)				Outside central cities	81,001	81,436	-.5
Napa (see Vallejo-Napa, Calif.)				Provo-Orem, Utah	532,602	433,792	22.8
Nashville, Tenn.	463,628	381,609	21.5	In central cities	106,991	81,912	30.6
Nashville	170,874	174,307	-2.0	Provo	54,441	37,288	46.0
Outside central city	292,754	207,302	41.2	Orem	36,047	28,937	24.6
New Bedford, Mass.	143,176	141,984	0.8	Outside central cities	18,394	8,351	120.3
New Bedford	102,477	109,189	-6.1	Pueblo, Colo.	52,550	44,624	17.8
Outside central city	40,699	32,795	24.1	Pueblo	118,707	90,188	31.6
New Britain, Conn.	129,397	104,251	24.1	Outside central city	91,181	63,685	43.2
New Britain	82,201	73,726	11.5	Outside central city	27,626	26,503	3.9
Outside central city	47,196	30,525	54.6	Racine, Wis.	141,781	109,585	29.4
New Haven, Conn.	320,836	273,049	17.5	Racine	89,144	71,193	25.2
New Haven	152,048	164,443	-7.5	Outside central city	52,637	38,392	37.1
Outside central city	168,788	108,606	55.4	Raleigh, N.C.	169,082	136,450	23.9
New London-Groton-Norwich, Conn.	170,981	134,612	27.0	Raleigh	98,931	65,679	49.0
In central cities	72,688	68,184	6.6	Outside central city	70,151	70,771	-0.9
New London	34,182	30,551	11.9	Reading, Pa.	275,414	255,740	7.7
Norwich	38,506	37,633	2.3	Reading	98,177	109,320	-10.2
Outside central cities	98,293	66,428	48.0	Outside central city	177,237	146,420	21.0
New Orleans, La.	907,123	712,393	27.3	Reno, Nev.	84,743	50,205	68.8
New Orleans	627,525	570,445	10.0	Reno	51,470	32,497	58.4
Outside central city	279,598	141,948	97.0	Outside central city	33,273	17,708	87.9
New York, N.Y.	10,694,633	9,555,943	11.9	Richmond, Va.	436,044	350,035	24.6
New York	7,781,984	7,891,957	-1.4	Richmond	230,958	230,310	-4.5
Outside central city	2,912,649	1,663,986	75.0	Outside central city	216,086	119,725	80.5
Newark, N.J.	1,689,420	1,468,458	15.0	Riverside (see San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif.)			
Newark	405,220	438,776	-7.6	Roanoke, Va.	158,803	133,407	19.0
Outside central city	1,284,200	1,029,682	24.7	Roanoke	97,110	91,921	5.6
Newport News-Hampton, Va.	224,503	154,977	44.9	Outside central city	61,693	41,486	48.7
In central cities	202,920	143,227	41.7	Rochester, N.Y.	732,688	615,044	19.1
Newport News	113,662	82,283	38.2	Rochester	318,611	332,488	-4.2
Hampton	89,258	60,994	46.3	Outside central city	413,977	282,556	46.5
Outside central cities	21,583	11,750	83.7				

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18869

TABLE 2.—1960 and 1950 population inside and outside central city or cities of standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963—Continued

[Minus sign (—) denotes decrease. Percent not shown where less than 0.1]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase	Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase
Rock Island (see Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, Iowa-Ill.)				Stamford, Conn.	178,409	134,896	32.3
Rockford, Ill.	230,091	169,455	35.8	Stamford	92,713	74,293	24.8
Rockford	126,706	92,927	36.4	Outside central city	85,696	60,603	41.4
Outside central city	103,385	76,528	35.1	Steubenville-Weirton, Ohio, and West Virginia	167,756	157,787	6.3
Rome (see Utica-Rome, N.Y.)				In central cities	60,696	59,877	1.4
Sacramento, Calif.	625,503	359,429	74.0	Steubenville	32,495	35,872	-9.4
Sacramento	191,667	137,572	39.3	Weirton	28,201	24,005	17.5
Outside central city	433,836	221,857	95.5	Outside central cities	107,060	97,910	9.3
Saginaw, Mich.	190,752	153,515	24.3	Stockton, Calif.	249,989	200,750	24.5
Saginaw	98,265	92,918	5.8	Stockton	86,321	70,853	21.8
Outside central city	92,487	60,597	52.6	Outside central city	163,668	129,897	26.0
St. Joseph, Mo.	90,581	96,826	-6.4	Superior. (See Duluth-Superior, Minn., and Wisconsin)			
St. Joseph	79,673	78,588	1.4	Syracuse, N.Y.	563,781	465,114	21.2
Outside central city	10,908	18,238	-40.2	Syracuse	216,038	220,583	-2.1
St. Louis, Mo., and Illinois	2,104,609	1,755,334	19.9	Outside central city	347,743	244,531	42.2
St. Louis	750,026	856,796	-12.5	Tacoma, Wash.	321,690	275,876	16.6
Outside central city	1,354,583	898,538	50.8	Tacoma	147,979	143,673	3.0
St. Paul. (See Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.)				Outside central city	173,611	132,203	31.3
St. Petersburg. (See Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.)				Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.	772,453	409,143	88.8
Salt Lake City, Utah	447,795	305,762	46.5	In central cities	450,268	221,419	106.1
Salt Lake City	189,454	182,121	4.0	Tampa	274,970	124,681	120.5
Outside central city	258,341	123,641	108.9	St. Petersburg	181,298	96,738	87.4
San Angelo, Tex.	64,630	58,929	9.7	Outside central cities	316,185	187,724	68.4
San Angelo	58,815	52,093	12.9	Terre Haute, Ind.	172,069	172,468	-2.2
Outside central city	5,815	6,836	-14.9	Terre Haute	72,500	64,214	12.9
San Antonio, Tex.	716,168	525,852	36.2	Outside central city	99,569	108,254	-8.0
San Antonio	587,718	408,442	43.9	Texarkana, Tex.-Ark.	91,657	94,580	-3.1
Outside central city	128,450	117,410	9.4	In central cities	50,006	40,628	23.1
San Benito. (See Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex.)				Texarkana, Tex.	30,218	24,753	22.1
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif.	809,782	451,688	79.3	Texarkana, Ark.	19,788	15,875	24.6
In central cities	222,871	132,694	68.0	Outside central cities	41,651	53,952	-22.8
San Bernardino	91,922	63,058	45.8	Texas City. (See Galveston-Texas City, Tex.)			
Riverside	84,332	46,764	80.3	Toledo, Ohio and Michigan	630,647	530,822	18.8
Ontario	46,617	22,872	103.8	Toledo	318,003	303,616	4.7
Outside central cities	586,911	318,994	84.0	Outside central city	312,644	227,206	37.6
San Diego, Calif.	1,033,011	556,808	85.5	Topeka, Kans.	141,286	105,418	34.0
San Diego	573,224	334,387	71.4	Topeka	119,484	78,791	51.6
Outside central city	459,787	222,421	106.7	Outside central city	21,802	26,627	-18.1
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.	2,648,762	2,135,934	24.0	Trenton, N.J.	266,392	229,781	15.9
In central cities	1,107,864	1,159,932	-4.5	Trenton	114,167	128,009	-10.8
San Francisco	740,316	775,357	-4.5	Outside central city	152,225	101,772	49.6
Oakland	367,548	384,575	-4.4	Troy. (See Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y.)			
Outside central cities	1,540,898	976,002	57.9	Tucson, Ariz.	265,660	141,216	88.1
San Jose, Calif.	642,315	290,647	121.1	Tucson	212,892	45,454	368.4
San Jose	204,196	95,280	114.3	Outside central city	52,768	95,762	-44.9
Outside central city	438,119	195,367	124.4	Tulsa, Okla.	418,974	327,900	27.8
Santa Ana. (See Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove, Calif.)				Tulsa	261,685	182,740	43.2
Santa Barbara, Calif.	168,962	98,220	72.0	Outside central city	157,289	145,160	8.4
Santa Barbara	58,768	44,013	30.8	Tuscaloosa, Ala.	109,047	94,092	15.9
Outside central city	110,194	54,207	106.7	Tuscaloosa	63,370	46,396	36.6
Savannah, Ga.	188,299	151,481	24.3	Outside central city	45,677	47,696	-4.2
Savannah	149,245	119,638	24.7	Tyler, Tex.	86,350	74,701	15.6
Outside central city	39,054	31,843	22.6	Tyler	51,230	38,968	31.5
Schenectady. (See Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y.)				Outside central city	35,120	35,733	-1.7
Scranton, Pa.	234,531	257,396	-8.9	Urbana. (See Champaign-Urbana, Ill.)			
Scranton	111,443	125,536	-11.2	Utica-Rome, N.Y.	330,771	284,262	16.4
Outside central city	123,088	131,860	-6.7	In central cities	152,056	143,213	6.2
Seattle, Wash.	1,107,213	844,672	31.1	Utica	100,410	101,531	-1.1
Seattle	657,087	467,591	19.1	Rome	51,646	41,682	23.9
Outside central city	550,126	376,981	45.9	Outside central cities	178,715	141,049	26.7
Shreveport, La.	281,481	216,686	29.9	Vallejo-Napa, Calif.	200,487	151,436	32.4
Shreveport	164,372	127,206	29.2	In central cities	83,047	39,617	109.6
Outside central city	117,109	89,480	30.9	Vallejo	60,877	26,038	133.8
Sioux City, Iowa-Nebr.	120,017	114,318	5.0	Napa	22,170	13,679	63.3
Sioux City	89,159	83,991	6.2	Outside central cities	117,440	111,819	5.0
Outside central city	30,858	30,327	1.8	Waco, Tex.	150,991	130,194	15.3
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	86,575	70,910	22.1	Waco	97,808	84,706	15.5
Sioux Falls	65,406	52,696	24.2	Outside central city	52,283	45,488	14.9
Outside central city	21,169	18,214	15.9	Warren. (See Youngstown-Warren, Ohio.)			
South Bend, Ind.	271,057	234,526	15.6	Washington, D.C., Maryland, and Virginia	2,001,897	1,464,089	36.7
South Bend	132,445	115,911	14.3	Washington, D.C.	763,956	802,178	-4.8
Outside central city	138,612	118,615	16.9	Outside central city	1,237,941	661,911	87.0
Spokane, Wash.	278,833	221,561	25.6	Waterbury, Conn.	186,548	157,220	18.0
Spokane	181,608	161,721	12.3	Waterbury	107,130	104,477	2.5
Outside central city	96,725	59,840	61.6	Outside central city	78,418	52,743	48.7
Springfield, Ill.	146,539	131,484	11.5	Waterloo, Iowa	122,482	100,448	21.0
Springfield	83,271	81,628	2.0	Waterloo	71,755	65,198	10.1
Outside central city	63,268	49,856	26.9	Outside central city	50,727	35,250	43.9
Springfield, Mo.	126,276	104,823	20.5	Weirton. (See Steubenville-Weirton, Ohio and West Virginia.)			
Springfield	95,865	66,731	43.7	West Palm Beach, Fla.	228,106	114,688	98.9
Outside central city	30,411	38,092	-20.2	West Palm Beach	56,208	43,162	30.2
Springfield, Ohio	131,440	111,661	17.7	Outside central city	171,898	71,526	140.3
Springfield	82,723	78,508	5.4	Wheeling, W. Va. and Ohio	190,342	196,305	-3.0
Outside central city	48,717	33,153	46.9	Wheeling	53,400	58,891	-9.3
Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass., and Connecticut	493,999	422,163	17.0	Outside central city	136,942	137,414	-3.3
In central cities	288,705	266,271	8.4	Wichita, Kans.	381,626	253,291	50.7
Springfield	174,463	162,399	7.4	Wichita	254,698	168,279	51.4
Chicopee	61,553	49,211	25.1	Outside central city	126,928	85,012	49.3
Holyoke	52,689	54,661	-3.6	Wichita Falls, Tex.	129,638	105,309	23.1
Outside central cities	205,294	155,892	31.7	Wichita Falls	101,724	68,042	49.5
				Outside central city	27,914	37,267	-25.1
				Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Pa.	346,972	392,241	-11.5
				In central cities	95,607	112,317	-14.9
				Wilkes-Barre	63,651	76,826	-17.3
				Hazleton	32,056	35,491	-9.7
				Outside central cities	251,365	279,924	-10.2

18870

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

TABLE 2.—1960 and 1950 population inside and outside central city or cities of standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963—Continued

[Minus sign (—) denotes decrease. Percent not shown where less than 0.1]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase	Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	Percent increase
Wilmington, Del., Maryland, and New Jersey...	414,565	301,743	37.4	York, Pa.	290,242	246,934	17.5
Wilmington	95,827	110,356	—13.2	York	54,504	59,953	—9.1
Outside central city	318,738	191,387	66.5	Outside central city	235,738	186,981	26.1
Winston-Salem, N.C.	189,428	146,135	29.6	Youngstown-Warren, Ohio	509,006	416,544	22.2
Winston-Salem	111,135	87,811	26.6	In central cities	226,337	218,186	3.7
Outside central city	78,293	58,324	34.2	Youngstown	166,689	168,330	—1.0
Worcester, Mass.	328,898	306,269	7.4	Warren	59,648	49,856	19.6
Worcester	186,587	203,486	—8.3	Outside central cities	282,669	198,358	42.5
Outside central city	142,311	102,783	38.5				

¹ Incorporated between 1950 and 1960.² Includes population (14,204) of part of Norwich town annexed by Norwich city between 1950 and 1960.

TABLE 3.—Standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963, ranked in accordance with 1960 population

Rank	Standard metropolitan statistical area	Population	Rank	Standard metropolitan statistical area	Population
1	New York, N.Y.	10,694,633	81	Orlando, Fla.	318,487
2	Chicago, Ill.	6,220,913	82	Charlotte, N.C.	316,781
3	Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.	6,038,771	83	El Paso, Tex.	314,070
4	Philadelphia, Pa. and New Jersey	4,342,897	84	Peoria, Ill.	313,412
5	Detroit, Mich.	3,762,360	85	Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex.	306,016
6	San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.	2,648,762	86	Lansing, Mich.	298,949
7	Boston, Mass.	2,595,481	87	Bakersfield, Calif.	291,984
8	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,405,435	88	York, Pa.	290,242
9	St. Louis, Mo. and Illinois	2,104,669	89	Binghamton, N.Y. and Pennsylvania	283,600
10	Washington, D.C., Maryland, and Virginia	2,001,897	90	Chattanooga, Tenn. and Georgia	283,169
11	Cleveland, Ohio	1,909,483	91	Shreveport, La.	281,481
12	Baltimore, Md.	1,727,023	92	Johnstown, Pa.	280,733
13	Newark, N.J.	1,689,420	93	Lancaster, Pa.	278,359
14	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	1,482,030	94	Spokane, Wash.	278,333
15	Buffalo, N.Y.	1,306,957	95	Duluth, Minn.-Superior, Wis.	276,596
16	Cincinnati, Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky	1,268,479	96	Reading, Pa.	275,414
17	Houston, Tex.	1,243,158	97	South Bend, Ind. and Michigan	271,057
18	Milwaukee, Wis.	1,232,731	98	Trenton, N.J.	266,392
19	Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J.	1,186,873	99	Des Moines, Iowa	266,315
20	Seattle, Wash.	1,107,213	100	Tucson, Ariz.	265,660
21	Kansas City, Mo.-Kans.	1,092,545	101	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	262,199
22	Dallas, Tex.	1,083,601	102	Columbia, S.C.	260,828
23	San Diego, Calif.	1,033,011	103	Greenville, S.C.	255,806
24	Atlanta, Ga.	1,017,188	104	Huntington, W. Va.-Ashland, Ky. and Ohio	254,780
25	Miami, Fla.	935,047	105	Charleston, S.C.	254,578
26	Denver, Colo.	929,385	106	Charleston, W. Va.	252,325
27	Indianapolis, Ind.	916,932	107	Erie, Pa.	250,582
28	New Orleans, La.	807,123	108	Stockton, Calif.	249,989
29	Portland, Oreg., and Washington	821,897	109	Greensboro-High Point, N.C.	246,820
30	Providence-Pawtucket, R.I., and Massachusetts	821,101	110	Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.	242,980
31	San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif.	809,782	111	Scranton, Pa.	234,531
32	Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.	772,453	112	Fort Wayne, Ind.	232,196
33	Columbus, Ohio	754,924	113	Rockford, Ill.	230,091
34	Rochester, N.Y.	732,588	114	Baton Rouge, La.	230,058
35	Dayton, Ohio	727,121	115	West Palm Beach, Fla.	228,106
36	Louisville, Ky., and Indiana	725,139	116	Newport News-Hampton, Va.	224,503
37	San Antonio, Tex.	716,168	117	Evansville, Ind. and Kentucky	222,890
38	Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove, Calif.	703,925	118	Madison, Wis.	222,095
39	Memphis, Tenn., and Arkansas	674,583	119	Corpus Christi, Tex.	221,573
40	Phoenix, Ariz.	663,510	120	Jackson, Miss.	221,367
41	Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y.	657,503	121	Columbus, Ga., and Alabama	217,985
42	San Jose, Calif.	642,315	122	Lorain-Elyria, Ohio	217,500
43	Birmingham, Ala.	634,864	123	Augusta, Ga., and South Carolina	216,639
44	Toledo, Ohio, and Michigan	630,647	124	Austin, Tex.	212,136
45	Sacramento, Calif.	625,503	125	Pensacola, Fla.	203,376
46	Jersey City, N.J.	610,734	126	Vallejo-Napa, Calif.	200,487
47	Akron, Ohio	605,367	127	Montgomery, Ala.	199,734
48	Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.	578,507	128	Lawrence, Mass. and Haverhill, N.H.	199,136
49	Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind.	573,548	129	Hamilton-Middletown, Ohio	199,076
50	Fort Worth, Tex.	573,215	130	Saginaw, Mich.	190,752
51	Syracuse, N.Y.	563,781	131	Wheeling, W. Va., and Ohio	190,342
52	Hartford, Conn.	549,249	132	Winston-Salem, N.C.	189,428
53	Oklahoma City, Okla.	511,833	133	Savannah, Ga.	188,299
54	Youngstown-Warren, Ohio	509,006	134	Waterbury, Conn.	185,548
55	Honolulu, Hawaii	500,409	135	Macon, Ga.	180,403
56	Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass., and Connecticut	493,999	136	Stamford, Conn.	178,409
57	Allen-Town-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa., and New Jersey	492,168	137	Ann Arbor, Mich.	172,440
58	Nashville, Tenn.	463,628	138	Terre Haute, Ind.	172,069
59	Grand Rapids, Mich.	461,006	139	New London-Groton-Norwich, Conn.	170,981
60	Omaha, Nebr., and Iowa	457,873	140	Kalamazoo, Mich.	169,712
61	Jacksonville, Fla.	455,411	141	Raleigh, N.C.	169,082
62	Salt Lake City, Utah	447,795	142	Santa Barbara, Calif.	168,962
63	Richmond, Va.	436,044	143	Steubenville-Weirton, Ohio, and West Virginia	167,756
64	Tulsa, Okla.	418,974	144	Lowell, Mass.	164,243
65	Flint, Mich.	416,239	145	Eugene, Oreg.	162,890
66	Wilmington, Del., Maryland, and New Jersey	414,565	146	Atlantic City, N.J.	160,880
67	Wichita, Kans.	381,626	147	Roanoke, Va.	158,803
68	Harrisburg, Pa.	371,653	148	Lubbock, Tex.	156,271
69	Knoxville, Tenn.	368,080	149	Lincoln, Nebr.	155,272
70	Fresno, Calif.	365,945	150	Huntsville, Ala.	153,861
71	Mobile, Ala.	363,389	151	Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex.	151,085
72	Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Pa.	346,972	152	Waco, Tex.	150,091
73	Canton, Ohio	340,345	153	Muskegon-Muskegon Heights, Mich.	149,943
74	Bridgeport, Conn.	337,983	154	Amarillo, Tex.	149,493
75	Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla.	333,946	155	Brockton, Mass.	149,458
76	Utica-Rome, N.Y.	330,771	156	Springfield, Ill.	146,539
77	Worcester, Mass.	328,898	157	Lake Charles, La.	145,475
78	Tacoma, Wash.	321,590	158	Colorado Springs, Colo.	143,742
79	New Haven, Conn.	320,836	159	New Bedford, Mass.	143,176
80	Davenport, Iowa and Rock Island-Moline, Ill.	319,375	160	Racine, Wis.	141,781

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18871

TABLE 3.—Standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as defined on Oct. 18, 1963, ranked in accordance with 1960 population.—Continued

Rank	Standard metropolitan statistical area	Population	Rank	Standard metropolitan statistical area	Population
161	Topeka, Kans.	141,286	189	Provo-Orem, Utah	106,991
162	Galveston-Texas City, Tex.	140,364	190	Fargo, N. Dak., and Moorhead, Minn.	106,027
163	Portland, Maine	139,122	191	Lima, Ohio	103,691
164	Fall River, Mass.-R.I.	138,156	192	Manchester, N.H.	102,861
165	Altoona, Pa.	137,270	193	Monroe, La.	101,663
166	Cedar Rapids, Iowa	136,899	194	Kenosha, Wis.	100,615
167	Fort Smith, Ark.-Okla.	136,110	195	Gadsden, Ala.	96,980
168	Champaign-Urbana, Ill.	132,436	196	Norwalk, Conn.	96,756
169	Jackson, Mich.	131,994	197	Boise City, Idaho	93,460
170	Lexington, Ky.	131,906	198	Texarkana, Tex. and Ark.	91,657
171	Springfield, Ohio	131,440	199	Odessa, Tex.	90,995
172	Asheville, N.C.	130,074	200	Lawton, Okla.	90,803
173	Wichita Falls, Tex.	129,638	201	St. Joseph, Mo.	90,581
174	New Britain, Conn.	129,397	202	Fitchburg-Leominster, Mass.	90,158
175	Las Vegas, Nev.	127,016	203	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	86,575
176	Springfield, Mo.	126,276	204	Tyler, Tex.	86,350
177	Green Bay, Wis.	125,082	205	Reno, Nev.	84,743
178	Waterloo, Iowa	122,482	206	Lafayette, La.	84,656
179	Arlene, Tex.	120,377	207	Dubuque, Iowa	80,048
180	Sioux City, Iowa, and Nebr.	120,017	208	Billings, Mont.	79,016
181	Pueblo, Colo.	118,707	209	Pittsfield, Mass.	76,772
182	Decatur, Ill.	118,257	210	Albany, Ga.	75,680
183	Durham, N.C.	111,995	211	Great Falls, Mont.	73,418
184	Muncie, Ind.	110,938	212	Lewiston-Auburn, Maine	70,295
185	Ogden, Utah	110,744	213	Midland, Tex.	67,717
186	Lynchburg, Va.	110,701	214	Laredo, Tex.	64,791
187	Tuscaloosa, Ala.	109,047	215	San Angelo, Tex.	64,630
188	Bay City, Mich.	107,042	216	Meriden, Conn.	51,850

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I listened with great interest, as I always do, to the remarks of the distinguished minority leader today, regarding the pending amendment. He said, at one point, that the purpose of the amendment was to buy time, and that the purpose of the additional time was to enable the Congress and the States to enact a constitutional amendment to overturn the decision of the Court in Reynolds against Sims.

I wish to say that I agree with the distinguished minority leader when he says that this amendment is to provide time, because there have arisen in several States situations which require additional time to be properly worked out in an orderly manner. However, I do not agree that the purpose of the additional time is to allow the passage of a constitutional amendment to overturn the Reynolds decision. In the first place the time allowed by this amendment, which will in most cases end at the conclusion of the first State legislative session after the election this November, will probably not be long enough to complete the processes required for the adoption of a new constitutional amendment.

Second, although I thoroughly agree that the States should have the opportunity to vote on a constitutional amendment allowing them to apportion their own legislatures as they see fit, I do not believe this chance to vote must come while the State legislatures are still apportioned as they are today. That would give an alleged malapportioned State legislature the power to validate itself, the right to pass upon its own validity, and the ability to perpetuate itself indefinitely. That does not seem just to me. I am certainly in favor of giving the people the opportunity to vote as they wish on such a proposed constitutional amendment. But when that vote comes, it should be on the basis of one man, one vote, as required by the Reynolds decision.

May I say also that, in my opinion, this amendment does not make the

granting of the stay mandatory along the percentage stated by the distinguished minority leader—the figure, I believe, was 99½ percent—but considerably, very considerably less—perhaps 75 to 25 especially in those States well on the way to a successful and constitutional apportionment.

Mr. President, in the amendment before us, everything I am sorry to say—is not as we would like it to be. It is not all black, nor is it all white. There are shades of gray. Men of good will and men who believe in the Constitution can find a meeting of the minds if they will set themselves to it, and if they will not make up their minds before they have a chance to look up the facts and to evaluate the picture.

Last June the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its decision in the historic case of Reynolds against Sims. The decision held that equal protection of the laws, which is guaranteed by our Constitution, required, in the election of a State legislature, that each person in a State have the same value assigned to his vote as every other person. This was stated in the now famous phrase, “one person, one vote.”

Since that time the district courts of the United States and the State governments have endeavored to carry out this requirement of the Constitution as speedily and with as little confusion as possible. Generally these efforts have been successful. In several cases, however, because of the demands of time and the nearness of the fall election, the actions taken have been disruptive upon these particular States governing and electoral procedures. It is clear this result was not intended by the Supreme Court which warned against hasty actions of reapportionment where the State election machinery was already in process.

We are met, therefore, with a situation not totally intended or expected and it is a situation which, I believe, the Congress can and should make some attempt to ease, within the bounds of its constitutional power to do so.

The design of the original Dirksen amendment was to put off for two meetings of the State legislatures in any State involved in the apportionment problem, the implementation of the Court rule. In the meantime, supporters of that amendment hoped that a constitutional amendment could be achieved. But, of course, that is a far cry from the proposal which is before the Senate today. It is as different as day is from night. In my opinion, the first amendment was clearly unconstitutional. This one, I believe, is constitutional. As a result of the efforts put forth by the joint leadership, the attorneys attached to the Senate, and the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, we think we have come up with something which is within the requirement of the law, which recognizes the decision of the Court, which does not try to overturn that decision. It does seek through the use of a brief stay where it is necessary to bring about a settling of a situation which has developed to serious proportions in various States.

There is a need for flexibility. No Member of this body will gainsay that fact in view of what is happening in such States as Oklahoma, New York, and Colorado.

The amendment which Senator DIRKSEN has introduced, and of which I am a cosponsor, in my judgment is a great improvement over those proposals which would have, in effect, suspended the constitutional right of equal protection for an extended period of time. The amendment is, under section 5 of the 14th amendment, an exercise of the congressional power to enforce and implement by appropriate legislation the requirements of that 14th amendment. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois and myself merely attempts to establish an orderly procedure in the carrying out of the constitutional requirement of the Reynolds against Sims decision in a situation where some congressional guidance may be helpful. This amendment is not in anyway an

attempt to overturn or subvert that decision. The basic purpose of this amendment is to allow the States one election and one session of the legislature which could be before or after that election, so that the States might be given a chance to solve their own apportionment problem. If at the end of that limited period the State has not by its own governing processes met the constitutional requirement, then section (d) of the amendment requires the district courts to do it for them. Furthermore, the stay of action suggested by this amendment is to be measured in terms of the public interest. In the opinion of many, the public interest and the requirements of orderly Government necessitate the States having this opportunity. But the amendment provides that even this chance need not be given where highly unusual circumstances would indicate that it should not be.

There are many who will not be satisfied with this amendment, and I can only say to them that there are also many who were not to be satisfied by anything else.

In my opinion we have not by this amendment interfered with the decision of the court but have instead helped to implement it in a way which will in the long run add strength to its meaning. It would seem to me that the malapportionment, or misbalance, which existed in some States until this time has been indefensible. In one State, for example, I am informed that every voter in one county had the equivalent power in State elections of 100 voters in another.

In other States, the State legislatures had failed to redistrict and reapportion themselves for many decades despite the plain requirement of their own constitutions to do so.

To those who say that governing initiative in this country has passed from the States to the central government, I point out that perhaps this is one of the reasons why. A free people will not long respect nor patiently submit to an unresponsive government. Insofar as some State governments have been grossly malapportioned, it is likely also that they have been unresponsive. It may be that in the end the requirement for fair apportionment in the State governments will bring about a resurgence of strong influence by State governments upon our Nation's affairs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has made a very constructive and helpful statement. It begins to give the kind of meaningful judicial discretion which is mighty important if we are to have an amendment that is not unconstitutional and is workable. I deeply appreciate the fine statement which the Senator has made.

I should like to add one further point. It seems to those of us who believe in one man-one vote that we should not delay apportionment. We should proceed. There are situations such as that in Oklahoma that from a practical standpoint are very difficult. That is why I offered the pending amendment, the

Proxmire amendment to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment. This would provide that the stay, in Court action for the period necessary, shall not—I repeat, not—be deemed to be in the public interest in the absence of highly unusual circumstances. But under such circumstances, a court might find in Oklahoma that the highly unusual circumstances would make a stay wise and necessary. There may be difficulties which would cause enormous inconvenience and great difficulty for those running.

It seems that the amendment I have just called up would turn the proposal around and make it in fact as different as night and day from the other proposal. It would still rely on the one man-one vote principle. It would say to the court that the court should not stay reapportionment except under unusual circumstances that would cause great difficulty to those involved. I commend the Senator from Montana, our majority leader, for his very helpful statement, which is a characteristic of his whole attitude. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am deeply grateful to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his remarks.

I point out that when we try to reach an agreement which will be satisfactory to a majority of the Members of this body, it is not an easy task. We spent many days since last Thursday—in effect, until yesterday afternoon—trying to draft an amendment which would uphold the powers of the Court and at the same time bring relief to those States which are in distress because of the Court decision which had been handed down.

I did not get all that I wished in the amendment. The distinguished minority leader did not get all that he wanted. But we arrived at a consensus in the gray area which we thought would face the situation, which would recognize that the courts had powers which should be adhered to, but which also recognized a situation which affected several of the States of the Union, and in which the need for some alleviation seemed to be very apparent.

We have done our best. We hope that the Senate will understand the spirit in which we carried on these bipartisan negotiations.

In response to a statement made by a Senator earlier today, I wish to say that the negotiations were not carried on in secret. I am sure that every Senator knew about what the leadership was doing. The press reported our doings quite carefully. We did not rush out and give them bulletins every hour on the hour, because we were trying to do a constructive and workmanlike job. We think we have accomplished that. It was not easy, but we have laid our proposal before the Senate and now it is for the Senate to decide.

AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

reconsider the vote by which Calendar No. 1306, Senate bill 2981, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2981) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alignment, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12196.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12196) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alignment, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause be stricken, and that the text of the bill S. 2981, be substituted therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the bill H.R. 12196 be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time; the bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2981 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF TIME WITH REGARD TO CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION BY THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1313, Senate bill 2460.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2460) to amend the act of July 13, 1959, so as to extend the period of time within which certain construction may be undertaken by the State of Missouri on